w w Tracts 1274.

ANSWER

TO

DR JAMES HAMILTON,

JUNIOR.

BY *DR GREGORY.*

He that maketh haſte to be rich, ſhall not be innocent.

SOLOMON.

EDINBURGH:

1793.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/b22391265

PREFACE.

SINCE Dr James Hamilton junior has thought fit to make an appeal to the Public, by printing and diſtibuting certain Letters, in which he repreſents himſelf as an injured man, and ſtrongly inſinuates, that I am one of his greateſt wrong-doers, it is incumbent on me to meet him before that tribunal which he himſelf hath choſen: indeed it is impoſſible for me to decline it, after telling him (as I did in that Letter which he has printed) that "my conduct from firſt to laſt in the buſineſs had been upright and open; and "that I cared not how generally it was "known, or how ſeverely it was ſcrutinized."

IT never was my intention to injure him; but, on the contrary, to obtain for him, and others concerned, the ſtricteſt

juſtice. It was impoſſible for me to wiſh to injure him; for he had never injured nor offended me. But without inſiſting on any ſuch argument *a priori*, I ſhall mention juſt one proof, which muſt convince every perſon, that my conduct was open, and my intentions upright, with reſpect to the enquiry which I wiſhed to be made concerning the origin of that ill-fated Pamphlet ſo generally imputed to Dr J. H. or to his Father, or to both of them jointly; and now ſo ſtrenuouſly diſavowed by them both: I endeavoured to obtain a ſtrict judicial inveſtigation of that point.—That ſuch was my object and my endeavour from firſt to laſt, the Univerſity record, and even my letter to Dr J. H. junior, which he hath printed, will amply teſtify. But this mode of inveſtigation and deciſion, both he and his Father, after maturely conſidering the matter for ſix weeks, have declined; and inſtead of it he hath contented himſelf with an Appeal to the Public. What his reaſons for this conduct may have been, he beſt knows; but the moſt certain and obvious effect of it is to preclude me from calling on thoſe perſons as witneſſes, who,

ac-

according to my information, could give the moſt deciſive teſtimony with reſpect to the origin and hiſtory of the Pamphlet in queſtion; but which teſtimony, I have good reaſon to think, they will not give, unleſs made to do ſo in the courſe of judicial proceedings.

MANY circumſtances about that unlucky Pamphlet appeared to me to deſerve animadverſion.

IT related to our Univerſity; it was addreſſed to our ſtudents, and profeſſed to give them directions with reſpect to their conduct, and the courſe of their ſtudies; it was formally dedicated to the Medical Profeſſors, and, as a name that had no appearance of being feigned was given on the title-page, it ſeemed to come out under our patronage, or at leaſt with our knowledge and approbation.—But it was ſoon diſcovered that the name on the title-page was not the real name of the author; none of the Profeſſors to whom it was dedicated, or of the bookſellers who ſold it, knew any ſuch perſon; and one of the latter (Mr Mudie) mentioned frankly, that

that he had been told by the London publiſhers, (the Meſſ. Robinſons, who ſent the Pamphlet down to ſeveral book-ſellers here), that the name on the title-page was a falſe one.

It ſoon appeared by the moſt complete and irreſiſtible internal evidence, that the chief purpoſe of the Pamphlet was to raiſe the fame and promote the pecuniary intereſt of Dr Hamilton, the Profeſſor of Midwifery in this Univerſity. This was attempted with the moſt injudicious and ſhameleſs eagerneſs. Much praiſe too was beſtowed on ſeveral members of the Univerſity, whoſe conduct had been obliging to Dr H. or who were united by ſome bond of friendſhip with him or with his Son. And a moſt inſidious and malevolent attempt was made to undermine the profeſſional character, and hurt the fortune of others, whoſe conduct had been diſobliging to Dr H. or whoſe intereſt was either eſſentially or accidentally inconſiſtent with his. This malevolence appeared moſt remarkably with reſpect to the Profeſſors of Botany and of Mathematics; and with reſpect

reſpect to a certain private Teacher of Anatomy and Midwifery.

It plainly appeared from the tenor of the Pamphlet, that the author of it was minutely acquainted with many of the moſt recent tranſactions in the Univerſity; and that he had the moſt intimate knowledge of every particular relating to Dr H.'s lectures, and their peculiar merits, and his plan of teaching; and that he expreſſed himſelf on theſe points, in many paſſages at leaſt, and even on ſome other points, in the well-known words and phraſes of Dr H. which were immediately recogniſed by many of his ſtudents.—Of the juſtneſs of this remark I myſelf could in ſome meaſure judge, though I had never heard nor read any of his lectures: for, many years ago, in conſequence of a pretty extraordinary accident, I had heard Dr H. expreſs himſelf without reſerve on the ſame ſubjects; and I recogniſed at once in the Pamphlet many of his ſentiments, and ſome of his moſt remarkable expreſſions. But what was to me ſtill more ſtriking, I found that the author of the Pamphlet had adopted, and actually

tually executed a particular intention, which I knew to be Dr H.'s, having myſelf heard him avow it. This the author of the Pamphlet has done, by making, in very rancorous terms, a certain enquiry, which I had heard Dr H. declare, in the moſt vehement and paſſionate manner, that he *muſt* make.—This enquiry relates to a point highly intereſting to the Profeſſor of Midwifery in this Univerſity, and to thoſe connected with him; but not in the leaſt intereſting to any other body.

THOUGH the Pamphlet is dated *London*, yet when enquiry was made at one of the Meſſ. Robinſons, (the London publiſhers), he declared that they got it from their correſpondent at Edinburgh. But, after taking time to write to Edinburgh, and receive an anſwer, they refuſed to give up the author, or to tell from whom they had received it.

THE Pamphlet, in ſo far as it related to Dr Hamilton, appeared to be, to all intents and purpoſes, a quack bill in his favour. As no ſuch publication was ever yet known or ſuppoſed to come forth without

without the knowledge and participation of the perſon whoſe intereſt it was intended to ſerve, it was immediately ſuppoſed, that this one proceeded either directly or indirectly from him. And this almoſt irreſiſtible preſumption was ſo much confirmed by the concurrent circumſtances that little or no doubt was entertained of it. I had occaſion to hear that the "Guide was ſoon ſpoken of among our ſtudents by the name of Dr H.'s Pamphlet.

In this ſuſpicion, or rather belief, Dr J. H. junior was of courſe involved; for he ſtill lives in his father's houſe, as a member of his family, and in the moſt cordial intimacy and affection with him, and acts as his father's aſſiſtant in the practice and in the teaching of midwifery, and is his Father's known and avowed aſſiſtant, or rather his agent in the writing of books *.

The internal and circumſtantial evidence ſeemed to affect equally both Fa-

* See Preface to Dr H.'s Treatiſe on the Management of Female Complaints, &c. pag. vii.; and Letters to Dr Oſborn, pages 86. & 105.

ther and Son: nor do I believe any perſon thought of making a diſtinction between them in that reſpect. It ſeemed almoſt a phyſical as well as a moral impoſſibility for the one to have written ſuch a Pamphlet without the knowledge and participation of the other.

So ſtrong and ſo public was the belief with reſpect to Dr J. H. that he ſoon was fain to try the ſad unavailing expedient of a formal diſavowal of the Pamphlet; as appears by his letter of November 23. to Dr Rutherford, which he hath printed.

About a fortnight afterwards I chanced to learn that he had been diſclaiming it in *viva voce* converſation with another gentleman, whom he requeſted (as he had done Dr Rutherford) to contradict the report of his being concerned in it. This gentleman adviſed him to do that in the only effectual manner, by applying to J. Johnſon the author, through the Meſſ. Robinſons, the London publiſhers, and getting him to ſtand forth. This good advice, which was indeed a ſevere touch-

ſtone,

ſtone, Dr J. H. declined, by his father's advice, as he ſaid; and for a moſt abſurd reaſon, to ſay no worſe of it, namely, that it would look like throwing the burden of it on Dr Rotheram, who, he ſaid, had been vaguely, but he thought unjuſtly, pointed at as the author; and added, that it was probable that the author had received ſome hints which might have led to the preſent publication, from his father or himſelf, by means of information conveyed to a friend in London.

I could not ſuppoſe Dr J. H. to have uſed his Father's name on this occaſion falſely: I therefore underſtood it as a kind of indirect acknowledgement that he (the Father) was in the ſecret: the inſinuation of hints and information being conveyed to a friend in London, appeared to be a fineſſe, (to give it no harſher name), for I had juſt learned that one of the London publiſhers had acknowledged having received the work from his correſpondent at Edinburgh: the admiſſion that it was probable the author had *received* hints from Dr H. or his Son, ſeemed to me irreſiſtibly to imply, that they had *given*

him hints; elſe it would not only not have been probable, but it would have been abſolutely impoſſible that he ſhould have received them. Such giving of hints is juſt what I ſhould call aſſiſting in, or being acceſſory to, the compoſition of ſuch a work. Nor can I perceive any difference in point of turpitude between giving ſuch aſſiſtance to it, and doing the whole of the work. The hint about the receiving of ſuch hints, ſeemed to be intended to account for the wonderfully accurate information in the Pamphlet about Dr H.'s lectures, &c. which was ſo ſtriking as to require ſome account to be given of it.

Such a publication, and ſuch ſuſpicions connected with it, appeared to me to require the moſt ſerious animadverſion, as touching the honour, the intereſt, the very exiſtence of our Univerſity. In vain ſhall the munificence of our Sovereign, the favour, partial perhaps, yet not, I truſt, quite unmerited, of our Country, the grateful attachment of thoſe who here firſt caught the flame of Virtue and of Science, rear for our uſe buildings more ſplendid than the Porticos of Athens, if attempts

are

are made to raiſe the fame and fill the pockets of any of our own number, by arts that would diſgrace an advertiſing or a circumforaneous Mountebank. For, unleſs the contrary be clearly proved, it will always be believed, that ſuch attempts are made either by the perſons whoſe intereſt they are intended to ſerve, or at leaſt with their knowledge and participation. And, if we allow ſuch things to paſs unnoticed, it will naturally be thought that we chooſe rather to connive at them, than to detect and puniſh them.

I thought it my duty, therefore, to call the attention of the *Senatus Academicus* to that Pamphlet; to inform all my colleagues of the general ſuſpicion or belief entertained with reſpect to the origin of it, and of the many ſtrong particulars of internal and concurrent circumſtantial evidence on which that opinion was founded; and to propoſe that thoſe diſgraceful ſuſpicions ſhould be done away ſpeedily and effectually by the only adequate means, a ſtrict judicial inquiry, which ſhould terminate either in the honourable acquittal, or complete conviction and puniſhment

puniſhment of the perſon ſuſpected. It was a duty to the Univerſity at large; more eſpecially it was a duty to my colleagues and my friends, whom the author of the Pamphlet had inſidiouſly attempted to injure: above all, it was a duty to the youth entruſted to our care; whom we ought not only to direct in the honourable paths of Science by our precepts, but alſo to guide in the ſacred ways of Truth and Virtue by our example.

Accordingly, at the meeting of the *Senatus Academicus*, December 10th 1792, I formally laid the matter before the Univerſity; having previouſly, by a circular letter to all my colleagues, informed them of my intention, and intreated them to attend the meeting; and having alſo, by an additional private letter to Dr H. intimated to him how much he was intereſted in the buſineſs, and how much it behoved him to attend.

I expreſſed in very plain terms my ſentiments of the turpitude of the Pamphlet; I read ſeveral paſſages of it, (the ſame that are quoted in the following pages), relating

ting to the Midwifery, the Botanical, and the Mathematical Claſſes, that my colleagues might clearly perceive the drift of it, and have ſome notion of the ſtrong internal evidence thence reſulting; I mentioned the reaſons there were for believing the name on the title-page of the Pamphlet to be a falſe one, and the ſtrong ſuſpicions, or general belief entertained, that Dr H. was concerned either as principal or acceſſory in the compoſition and publication of it; and I propoſed that it ſhould be made the ſubject of a ſtrict judicial enquiry; offering to ſtate, either at that time to the whole *Senatus Academicus*, or at any other time to a ſecret Committee, all the particulars of internal and circumſtantial evidence which were known to me; and as I thought would juſtify and require ſuch a proceeding.

This alternative I propoſed, becauſe I knew it was the wiſh of ſome of my colleagues, and in particular, of the Principal, to have the matter diſcuſſed in a ſmall Committee, rather than in a full meeting of the Univerſity. And it was referred to ſuch a Committee accordingly.

I propoſed an *enquiry* only, and ſtated the alternative of the complete conviction or full and honourable acquittal of the perſon ſuſpected, becauſe I did not think myſelf entitled to hazard a poſitive aſſertion on the force of internal and circumſtantial evidence only; eſpecially as, tho' it appeared to me irreſiſtibly ſtrong, it was in one reſpect ambiguous, for it might affect either Dr H. or his ſon; and from the tenor of ſome information which I had received, (at that time only at ſecond hand, but afterwards, about the end of December, I had it fully confirmed from the firſt hand), I thought it poſſible that any direct teſtimony, that ſhould be obtained by a judicial examination of the proper witneſſes, might affect the Son only, and not the Father. How far any teſtimony againſt the Son, the known aſſiſtant of the Father in practice, in teaching, and in writing books, could clear the Father of any concern in the unlucky Pamphlet, it was not for me to determine: but the poſſibility of it was at leaſt no reaſon for me to deſiſt from my propoſed enquiry.

I cannot conceive that any injuſtice was done to Dr H. by ſuch proceeding. Of the drift of the Pamphlet, and of the general belief entertained with reſpect to its origin, there could be no more doubt than of its exiſtence. If he was concerned in it, it behoved the Univerſity to know it; if he was not, it was for the honour and intereſt of the Univerſity, and ſtill more for his own, that he ſhould be cleared of all ſuſpicion.—Sure I am, that if ſuch a Pamphlet had been publiſhed in my favour, I ſhould have uſed my utmoſt endeavours to diſcover and expoſe the author of it; from a thorough conviction, that though all who knew me would regard it as a malicious piece of knavery intended to injure and provoke me, yet all who did not know me would conſider it as my own act and deed, and judge of me accordingly. If any of my colleagues had expreſſed his opinion to that effect, as founded on the preſumptive evidence, and had propoſed that ſtrict enquiry ſhould be made into it, I ſhould have eagerly ſeconded and urged the enquiry, and I ſhould have expected of my colleagues and my friends, (if I had any among

 them),

them), that they ſhould have done ſo too: juſt as I ſhould have done to any of them whom I conceived to be unjuſtly ſuſpected of ſuch illiberal conduct.

Dr H. moſt ſolemnly and vehemently diſavowed all knowledge of the compoſition and publication of the Pamphlet. He ſaid he could not conceive how ſuch particulars were in it about his lectures, unleſs that his Son had been correſponding with ſomebody in London about it.—This came ſo near to what I had learned three days before of what his Son had ſaid about the conveying of information and hints, &c. (page xi.) that I thought all was coming out; but I was diſappointed. —He went on to declare, that he had aſked his Son about it, who aſſured him that he had not done ſo, and had no concern in it; that he did not believe his Son would do ſuch a thing without his knowledge, and that he thought it impoſſible he ſhould have done it without his knowing it;—and was proceeding, when he was ſtopped and admoniſhed, that I had ſaid nothing about his Son. The truth is, I had avoided mentioning his name,

or

or even alluding to him; for this good reaſon, that he is no member of the Univerſity, nor conſequently ſubject to Academical authority or cenſure.

THE Committee met December 22. 1792, and after hearing what I and what Dr H. had to ſay, agreed on a long report, which, with very ſlight alteration, was adopted by the Univerſity at a meeting held January 1. 1793.

THEIR report, in ſo far as related to the enquiry, was as follows:

——" THAT though they are convinced, that the motive which alone induced Dr Gregory to bring forward this charge, was a zeal for juſtice, and for the honour of the Univerſity; yet they do not think that the circumſtances ſpecified by him do amount to ſuch evidence as could either juſtify the *Senatus Academicus* in founding any judicial proceeding upon it, or render it neceſſary to take any further ſteps in this matter."——

In ſhort, there was an end of the enquiry on the part of the Univerſity.

Victrix cauſa Diis placuit. I thought it my duty to bring the buſineſs before the *Senatus Academicus*; but they were well qualified to judge of it, and well entitled to diſpoſe of it as they pleaſed. It was no private or perſonal affair of mine, but their own public general concern. It could neither be my duty nor my intereſt, and I am ſure it was not my inclination, to quarrel with any of my colleagues about it. Accordingly, no vote or diviſion diſturbed the peaceful harmony of their ſociety; no expreſſion of diſſent diſgraced their fair record: the affair was decided unanimouſly. But previouſly I had required, as a matter of right, that a full and particular account of what I had ſaid with reſpect to Dr H. ſhould be inſerted in the Univerſity record, which was granted; but, at the particular deſire of the Principal, I allowed the phraſe *Quack-bill* to be expunged.

Such a full record of what I had ſaid with reſpect to Dr H. I conſidered and ſtated

ſtated as a matter of juſtice, not to myſelf only, but to him alſo, that he might have a fair opportunity to bring an action againſt me, if he ſeriouſly thought I had done him any wrong. I knew he had been threatening to do ſo, and at the meeting of the Committee, (December 22.) I had ſtrongly invited him to try it. But inſtead of the threatened proſecution, in about three weeks out came the appeal to the Public, in the name of Dr J. H. his Father appearing in it only in the character of a *witneſs;* and if not an abſolutely falſe witneſs, at leaſt a wilfully incorrect one.——But I have had the pleaſure of hearing from different quarters, that both Dr H. and his Son have expreſſed their intention of making this Anſwer of mine the ſubject of a legal proſecution. How they acquired ſuch accurate and premature intelligence of it, they beſt know.

As the caſe is probably a new one, it may be worth while to try it: but I own, ſuch a plan appears to me juſt as abſurd as it would be for a man to ſend his adverſary a challenge, and then proſecute

cute him for accepting it; or to bring an action againſt his adverſary, and then ſend him a challenge for making his defence.

The appeal to the Public was a kind of challenge; a very ſhameful one I own; but that is Dr J. H.'s buſineſs, not mine. It was his own deliberate choice; and he certainly would not have choſen ſo lamentable an expedient, unleſs he had expected to gain by it very great advantages. What the advantages of it are to him, I know as well as he does. But, *Nihil eſt ab omni parte beatum:* it has its diſadvantages too. From the moment that he called me before the Public, and repreſented me as injuring and calumniating him, and as denying what I had ſaid, it became not only my right, but my duty, to vindicate myſelf; to ſtate to that Public to which he has appealed, every fact, and circumſtance, and inference, which I think requiſite for my own juſtification; in particular, to expoſe every particular of that internal and circumſtantial evidence which had ſo completely determined my belief, (and that of many others), in oppoſition to his formal diſavowal

diſavowal of the Pamphlet imputed to him.

If the reſult ſhould not be quite agreeable to his wiſhes, nor the ſtyle and manner of the diſcuſſion altogether to his taſte, he cannot reaſonably complain. *Qui vult quod antecedit, non debet nolle quod conſequitur*, is an axiom of common ſenſe and equity, as well as law; and as it is an axiom of Midwifery alſo, I believe indeed the baſis of the whole ſcience, I preſume Dr J. H. junior muſt underſtand it thoroughly, and admit it in its full extent: If not, it is time he ſhould learn it.

THOUGH the Univerſity would not engage in my propoſed enquiry, I did not conceive myſelf thereby precluded, as an individual, from uſing my honeſt and diligent endeavours to detect the author of the Pamphlet. Some means for that

that purpoſe were, as I thought, in my power; with what ſucceſs I have employed them, will appear from the following Remarks on it, and account of the correſpondence I have had with its pſeudonymous author.

J. G.

St John Street,
April 20. 1793.

R E-

REMARKS

ON

THE PAMPHLET OF

J. JOHNSON, Esq.

I.

THE Pamphlet which is the ſubject of the following remarks was publiſhed by ſeveral bookſellers in this city about the end of October 1792, a few days before the meeting of the Medical Claſſes in the Univerſity of Edinburgh for

 the

the preſent Seſſion. But it was publiſhed in London, and, as I have been told, in Dublin too, ſome time before; with the evident purpoſe of attracting the attention and influencing the conduct of gentlemen who meant to come, or who were already come, to this Univerſity, in the proſecution of their medical ſtudies.

It is entitled, "A Guide for Gentlemen "ſtudying Medicine at the Univerſity of "Edinburgh." It ſhould have been entitled, "A Guide to the Midwifery Claſs, "and a Warning againſt the Botanical "and Mathematical Claſſes in the Uni-"verſity of Edinburgh;" for ſuch is the true intent and chief purpoſe of it, as will plainly appear from the following ample ſpecimens of it, which are faithfully extracted from the original Pamphlet; and which are *complete*, as being *all* that our Author has ſaid with reſpect to thoſe three claſſes. The reader may be aſſured, therefore, that no injuſtice is done to *J. Johnſon, Eſq;* by either miſrepreſenting or ſuppreſſing any part of his diſcourſe on thoſe points. I quote theſe paſſages at full length for another reaſon, namely, that his valuable and truly original work

is

is already becoming very ſcarce; and I wiſh to gratify the curious by a good ſample of it.

On the ſubject of *Midwifery*, which is his darling theme, he thus expreſſes himſelf.

MIDWIFERY.

" THE importance of the art of midwifery to mankind in general, is univerſally acknowledged; and that art is now conſidered, with much propriety, a very intereſting and neceſſary branch of medical education.

When the practice of midwifery was principally confined to *women*, it might be deemed merely a mechanical art; but, ſince *gentlemen* began to be employed in that line, it has become very different; for the treatment of the diſeaſes of women, in almoſt every ſtage of life, has, by common conſent, been conſigned to the charge of male-practitioners of midwifery. It is, therefore, very ſurpriſing, that this ſhould be the only medical claſs which candidates for degrees are not obliged to attend. Does

this proceed from the jealouſy of the other profeſſors, the negligence of the profeſſor of midwifery, or the ignorance of the patrons of the univerſity?

Dr Hamilton divides his courſe into four parts. In the firſt he explains every circumſtance in the ſtate of women before delivery, with which a practitioner ought to be acquainted; in the ſecond, he deſcribes the treatment, during child-bearing, in all the variety of caſes which can occur; in the third, he deſcribes the management of lying-in women; and in the fourth part, he exhibits a moſt complete view of the diſeaſes of children in early infancy.

In the firſt part the profeſſor explains the peculiarity of the ſtructure of women and the diſeaſes ariſing from that cauſe; he then proceeds to ſhew the effects of pregnancy, and the diſeaſes in conſequence, with the proper treatment. Many of the ſubjects of this part require to be illuſtrated by preparations, a complete collection of which has been procured by the preſent profeſſor, with much trouble and at a great expence.

In

In the ſecond part of the courſe, the management of all the variety of *labours* is detailed. In this part of his courſe Dr Hamilton is particularly eminent; for, without diſguſting his pupils with tedious minuteneſs, he deſcribes, moſt accurately, the treatment of every general caſe which can poſſibly happen.

His obſervations are illuſtrated by caſts in plaſter of Paris, and by demonſtrations on *machinery*, imitating women and children. Theſe demonſtrations are given at extra hours, by which the intention of them is completely fulfilled; and they are not hurried over at the ordinary time allotted for the lecture, as is done by moſt teachers.

The treatment of women in child-bed, forms the third part of the courſe; it is a very important ſubject, and, notwithſtanding the many authors who have written on it, is not yet fully explained. The profeſſor has paid particular attention to this part, and gives a very extenſive view of it.

In the fourth part of this valuable courſe, the nature and treatment of the diſeaſes in-

incident to children in early infancy, are pointed out.

Although theſe have lately attracted much attention, many of them are ſtill involved in obſcurity; and that practice, which is founded on philoſophical principles, now ſo univerſally adopted in the diſorders of grown people, has not hitherto been extended to the complaints of children.

The profeſſor has for many years, endeavoured to point out a rational practice in the different diſeaſes incident to infancy.

Dr Hamilton concludes his courſe with the hiſtory of midwifery. He divides this into two parts: in the firſt, he deſcribes the progreſs of midwifery; and, in the ſecond, he exhibits a critical view of the different works which have been publiſhed on that art.

The practice of midwifery is acquired in the lying-in ward of the Royal Infirmary; but, as it is on a very ſmall ſcale (containing only ſix patients at a time,) Dr Hamilton *engages* to furniſh his pupils with *private deliveries*, if they are very anxious to ſee much practice.

It

It muſt appear aſtoniſhing, that, in Edinburgh, there is no public lying-in hoſpital. Whether is this occaſioned by the fault of the inhabitants, or of the medical practitioners? it is a great reproach on the latter, at leaſt *.

Dr Hamilton has been aſſiſted, for above three years, by his *ſon*, whoſe education has been regulated with the *ſole deſign* of rendering him capable of that important taſk.

The courſe of lectures, given by the profeſſor and his aſſiſtant, calculated to exhibit a complete ſcientific view of the diſeaſes of women and children, ſhould be attended by every medical ſtudent, whatever his future proſpects may be; for, without a knowledge of theſe ſubjects, no practitioner of medicine can expect to ſucceed in buſineſs.

* Since this work was put to preſs, the author underſtands that propoſals for a lying-in hoſpital, on an extenſive ſcale, have been publiſhed, by the profeſſor of midwifery; and have been received with ſo much approbation, that the inſtitution will be eſtabliſhed, it is thought, in a ſhort time. *J. J.*

Method

Method of ſtudying Midwifery.

Dr Hamilton's courſe is conducted in ſuch a manner, that gentlemen are gradually inſtructed in the principles of the art; and, therefore, no book, as an aſſiſtant, except the profeſſor's "Outlines of Midwifery," ſhould be uſed for the firſt courſe. The ſtudent, however, ought to mark down, every day, the principal obſervations which have been made during the lecture.

In the ſecond courſe, Foſter's Midwifery, Denman's Introduction, White's Treatiſe on the management of Pregnant and Lying-in Women, and Underwood on the Diſeaſes of children, may be occaſionally conſulted; and in the third courſe, the ſtudent may peruſe Baudeloque's Midwifery with advantage.

Dr Hamilton is accuſtomed to mention, as he proceeds, the principal authors on the various ſubjects of which he treats, and to point out the circumſtances in which they judge properly, and in which they are miſtaken; this method is productive

ductive of important advantages to his pupils, and ſhould certainly be more univerſally adopted by lecturers than it is at preſent.

Dr Hamilton gives three courſes of lectures in the year; the firſt is begun at the end of October, the ſecond at the beginning of February, and the third in the firſt week of May. The fees are, three guineas, for the firſt; two guineas, for the ſecond; and one guinea, for the third courſe; after which the gentlemen are entitled to attend *gratis*. The fee for the lying-in ward is eleven ſhillings and ſixpence each courſe.

Dr Hamilton alſo takes private pupils, (named *annual pupils*), who, beſides attending the lectures and lying-in ward, are ſent to viſit patients in private practice.

As midwives are almoſt excluſively employed in *low life*, in Edinburgh; and as many of them are very ignorant; difficult caſes occur in a great proportion; Dr Hamilton's pupils are entruſted with the charge of theſe caſes; they deliver under the direction of the doctor *or his ſon*, and hence acquire a *complete knowledge* of the practice. They have alſo opportuni-

ties of attending puerperal complaints and chronic diſeaſes of women and children.

The advantage of being an annual pupil is, therefore, very great; but it unfortunately can be extended to few, for Dr Hamilton reſtricts the number. The fee paid by annual pupils is *ten guineas.*" *Pamphlet, Page* 26. 32.

" After the firſt year, the ſtudents comprehended under this order ſhould attend midwifery; becauſe a much more ſcientific courſe is given by Dr Hamilton than by any teacher in any other medical ſchool." *Pag.* 57.

" The advantage of attending anatomy, the inſtitutions of medicine, and materia medica, may probably be ſo obvious, that no illuſtration is required; but the uſe of midwifery, the firſt year, may not be ſo evident.

Dr Hamilton, in the treatment of every ſubject, proceeds on the ſuppoſition, that gentlemen are almoſt unacquainted with other branches of medicine; and, therefore, all the ſtudents underſtand him eaſily: hence midwifery can be attended more eaſily the firſt year, than during the ſecond, when their hours are occupied in the

the inveſtigation of ſubjects which require much time.

Beſides, if any circumſtance ſhould occur, which might render the knowledge of midwifery an intereſting object, as gentlemen, by paying for three courſes, have it in their power to attend gratis as long afterwards as they pleaſe, the ſooner they begin, they will reap the greater benefits." *Pag.* 58. 59.

" Midwifery is recommended on the third year, for the ſake of the important obſervations which Dr Hamilton makes on the diſeaſes of women and children." *Pag.* 60.

(Are theſe important obſervations on the diſeaſes of women and children not delivered in the firſt courſe of Dr Hamilton's lectures, which gentlemen are thus exhorted to attend? Or how is this matter managed? for it ſhould ſeem, at firſt view, that what was the third year, and the ſecond or third courſe of ſome gentlemen, might be the firſt year and the firſt courſe of others.)

" Every gentleman, therefore, who means to enter on buſineſs immediately after leaving the college, ought to endeavour

to viſit private patients during the laſt year of his reſidence in Edinburgh. This may be accompliſhed, by attending the ſhop of a reſpectable ſurgeon, or by becoming annual pupils to the Profeſſors * of midwifery. If the practice of midwifery will form any part of his future occupations, he ought by no means to loſe ſo favourable an opportunity for improvement in that line." *Pag.* 62. 63.

" Dr Hamilton's lectures are recommended to gentlemen, for whom this table is intended, on account of his valuable view of the diſeaſes of children, in which he is probably not equalled by any other teacher." *Pag.* 68.

" The mathematical claſs in ſummer, in the college of Edinburgh, muſt be perfectly inconſiſtent with the views of medical gentlemen; for it meets at the ſame hour with the lectures on midwifery, which ought not to be omitted by any ſtudent who remains in Edinburgh during the ſummer." *Pag.* 71. 72.

* Who are theſe PROFESSORS?

" MID-

" MIDWIFERY.

" THE importance of this claſs has been already ſo fully explained, that it is perhaps unneceſſary to add any thing on the ſubject.

No gentleman, who purſues the ſtudy of medicine, ought to neglect this claſs, whatever his future proſpects may be.

The extent of the preſent profeſſor's lectures far exceeds that of any other teacher; and as his courſe comprehends the diſeaſes incident to women, in the unimpregnated, pregnant, parturient, and puerperal ſtate, and alſo the complaints incident to children in early infancy, it ſhould be conſidered as one of the moſt important medical claſſes." *Pag.* 72.

Such are the ſentiments and the words of J. Johnſon, Eſq; with reſpect to Midwifery, and to the Profeſſor, or, as he is pleaſed to ſay, the Profeſſors of it in the univerſity of Edinburgh.

On the ſubject of Botany, and the profeſſor of it, he is much leſs enthuſiaſtic and

and rapturous; but not leſs edifying. His words are as follow:

" BOTANY.

" BOTANY, although more properly a branch of natural hiſtory, is included among the ſtudies which, by the laws of the college, are neceſſary for thoſe who mean to become candidates for the degree of doctor of medicine.

Botany was formerly, with great propriety, joined with the materia medica; it is now however taught ſeparately.

The ſtudy of Botany is highly ſeducing: few who purſue it, reflect that it is only in a very ſlight degree connected with medicine; hence many are led into a wide field of ſpeculation, which though it exhibits ſome of the moſt beautiful views in nature, carries off the attention from more profitable purſuits.

There is a public botanic garden in Edinburgh, for the purpoſe of illuſtrating the ſubjects of the lectures; and in it the claſs-room is ſituated.

In

In ſtudying botany the phyſiology of plants perhaps deſerves the principal attention. The long time which Dr R. employs in explaining the terms of the art, renders the ſtudy highly diſguſting to the general run of his pupils, and prevents him from doing ſufficient juſtice to the phyſiological department of his courſe.

The Linnæan ſyſtem of claſſification is now fully eſtabliſhed, and may be eaſily underſtood by peruſing Linnæus' Principia Botanica: it may, however, probably be better for medical purpoſes to direct the attention more particularly to the fifty-eight natural orders.

The late worthy Dr Hope uſed to conclude his courſe by the exhibition of the exotics belonging to the botanic garden, and by a deſcription of their powers in the cure of diſeaſes, &c. We learn, with much regret, that Dr R. has not hitherto paid proper attention to ſo important a part of the courſe.

It has been alledged with ſome plauſibility, that the ſtudy of botany, in the preſent improved ſtate of medicine, is not neceſſary to practitioners of the healing art, as all the medicines which the vege-

table

table kingdom furniſhes are found in the ſhops, and deſcribed in every treatiſe on the materia medica.

But when it is conſidered that botany, like other branches of natural hiſtory, has now become part of the education of every gentleman, no medical practitioner will chooſe to hazard his abilities being called in queſtion by his ignorance of the principles of a ſcience which is vulgarly believed to be neceſſary and ſubſervient to the ſtudy of medicine.

It muſt not, however, be forgotten, that medical ſtudents ſhould acquire all the knowledge eſſential to the practice of their profeſſion before they amuſe themſelves with ornamental accompliſhments."

He adds in a note,

" Though the botanic garden is maintained at the expence of government, two ſhillings and ſixpence is demanded from each ſtudent by the principal gardener. Such extortions are ſhameful." *Pag.* 12. —15.

It may be obſerved, that in this paſſage J. Johnſon, Eſq; as if conſcious of the ſhameful wrong he was doing, and afraid of

of ſome of the probable conſequences of his conduct, and anxious to evade thoſe conſequences by a ſpecies of chicane worthy of himſelf, has had recourſe to the wretched expedient of giving only the initial Dr R. inſtead of the Profeſſor's name at full length, Dr Rutherford. No ſuch precaution is uſed by him in mentioning the other profeſſors. But, independently of that characteriſtic expedient, the inſidious malevolence of the whole paſſage is very ſtriking. At any rate, our author is the beſt commentator on his own text, as he ſurely beſt underſtood his own meaning: which in a ſubſequent paſſage he has fully expreſſed, in ſuch a manner, that it can neither be miſtaken nor explained away.

" It is ſurpriſing that no private lectures on botany have ever been propoſed. A garden might be hired for a ſmall ſum, and there is certainly an excellent field for a man of abilities.

If the phyſiology, the method of cultivation, and the medical properties of plants, were deſcribed in an accurate manner; and the *terms* of botany and *principles* of claſſi-

 fication

fication explained in a ſyllabus, or at extra hours, inſtead of being made to form a part of the courſe, a valuable addition to the medical inſtitutions at Edinburgh would be eſtabliſhed.

Medical ſtudents would thus underſtand a part of natural hiſtory with which, *by the preſent mode of teaching it*, not above one in a hundred who attend the univerſity is acquainted." *Pag.* 43.

Next I muſt give a ſpecimen of our author's ſentiments with reſpect to the ſtudy of mathematics; for they are perfectly original and very inſtructive. He has taken occaſion to expreſs them fully in giving an account of the lectures read during ſummer in the univerſity of Edinburgh.

"MATHEMATICS.

"THE propriety of teaching the elements of mathematics in a public claſs, may be very much doubted. The firſt ſix books of Euclid, which form the foundation of the ordinary courſes on mathematics,

matics, cannot be acquired by attending *lectures*.

As the ſtudy of this ſcience ought to form a part of the preparatory acquiſitions of a medical ſtudent; if it has been neglected, he ſhould certainly endeavour to remedy the defect in his education.

The beſt means, however, for this purpoſe, is to attend a private teacher, who, at leſs expence, and in a ſhorter time, will qualify a young man for underſtanding natural philoſophy, better than any public profeſſor can do.

The mathematical claſs in ſummer, in the college of Edinburgh, muſt be perfectly inconſiſtent with the views of medical gentlemen; for it meets at the ſame hour with the lectures on midwifery, which ought not to be omitted by any ſtudent who remains in Edinburgh during the ſummer." *Pag.* 71. 72.

Laſtly, I ſhall quote what J. Johnſon, Eſq; is pleaſed to ſay with reſpect to myſelf. I wiſh it to be fully underſtood, as well from his own words as from my declaration, that there was no perſonal quarrel nor animoſity between us; nor any

thing ſaid in his Pamphlet with reſpect to me, at which I, as an individual, can be ſuppoſed to take offence.

" PRACTICE OF MEDICINE.

" ALL the claſſes already enumerated (except midwifery) may be conſidered to be ſubſervient to the practice of medicine, which is the important object of medical ſtudents.

Dr Gregory, whoſe abilities are ſo well known, ſucceeded the celebrated Dr Cullen in this charge. As he has not yet made out a perfect plan of lectures, very little can be ſaid reſpecting his courſe. In his public diſcourſe, when he firſt appeared in his preſent chair, he mentioned that he meant to lecture according to the order of Dr Cullen's Noſology: laſt year he only finiſhed the firſt order of that work; and this ſeaſon, we learn, he began where he left off.

Although, perhaps, it would be better for the general run of ſtudents, that a *complete view* of the practice of medicine ſhould be exhibited in every courſe; or,

in

in other words, that the explanation of the general principles of every diſeaſe ſhould be comprehended within one courſe; yet, as it is impoſſible for gentlemen to acquire the knowledge of the practice of medicine in a *ſingle ſeaſon*, the plan which Dr Gregory has adopted is probably the moſt eligible one.

By this means he is enabled to give a much more accurate deſcription of the ſeveral diſeaſes than could otherwiſe be done; and gentlemen attending two ſucceſſive courſes are not diſguſted with a repetition of the ſame ſubjects." *Pag.* 32. 33. 34.

But this is not all: J. Johnſon, Eſq; in his great goodneſs, when he is giving directions for the ſtudy of the inſtitutions of medicine, takes occaſion to praiſe ſtill more highly my former labours, as Profeſſor of the Theory of Phyſic. I quote his words:

" DR Gregory, who preceded Dr Duncan in the charge of this claſs, and whoſe lectures on the inſtitutions did him much honour, publiſhed a work, which ſhould be

be uſed as a text-book, for the firſt two parts of Dr Duncan's courſe. The beauty of the language is equalled by the value of the matter, which is ſo great, that, by means of the "*Conſpectus Medicinæ Theoreticæ*" alone, an adequate idea could, perhaps, be formed of the ſubject of theſe two parts." *Pag.* 23.

I hope I need not ſay that it is merely for the purpoſe I have mentioned, that I quote theſe paſſages in my own praiſe, and not from any vanity: I am not in the leaſt flattered by them; nor is it poſſible I ſhould be gratified by any praiſes beſtowed on me in ſuch a Pamphlet as that which I am conſidering, and by ſuch an author as J. Johnſon, Eſq;

II.

"SPEAK that I may ſee Thee," is the well known apophthegm of an ancient ſage. It was addreſſed by *Socrates* himſelf to a young man, who was juſt wiſe enough to hold his tongue; and who by that rare piece of diſcretion poſed the Philoſopher, notwithſtanding his ſuperior wiſdom, and his ſkill in phyſiognomy.

"Behold my deſire is, that mine Ad-"verſary had written a Book," is a ſentiment derived to us from ſtill higher authority.

On theſe two texts, both of which imply a juſt notion of the art of finding out a man from his ſpeech, or from his writings, I ſhall give a ſhort practical commentary, ſtrictly applicable to J. Johnſon, Eſq; and to his Pamphlet.

1. Firſt,

1. Firſt then, I obſerve, that whatever may be thought of his Pamphlet in many reſpects, it *muſt* have had an author or authors, as certainly as the Iliad of *Homer* or the *Principia* of *Newton*. I conceive too, that the principles, the underſtanding, the ſentiments, the paſſions, the intereſts, nay, the very profeſſion of the author of it, may as certainly be judged of from his compoſition, as the genius of *Homer* and of *Newton* may be known from their immortal works. If two or more perſons have been concerned in the compoſition of the Pamphlet which bears the name of J. Johnſon, Eſq; they muſt have acted in concert: for the ſame ſpirit and tendency, the ſame train of thought, and, to the beſt of my judgement, the ſame ſtyle, (only more animated and eloquent on the ſubject of midwifery), pervade it all. The occaſional uſe of the firſt perſon plural inſtead of the firſt perſon ſingular, *we* inſtead of *I*, ſeems to favour the ſuppoſition of the Pamphlet being the work of more than one perſon. But as that is a common Scotticiſm, even when a perſon is ſpeaking or writing for himſelf alone, I do

do not much rely on it; nor do I think the queſtion of any moment.

2. J. Johnſon, Eſq; *muſt be* a perfect enthuſiaſt in the practice and in the teaching of midwifery. This is the burden of the ſong; often repeated; ſtrongly inculcated; always kept in view; even in giving inſtructions for the ſtudy of mathematics not forgotten; praiſed and recommended in ſuch fulſome terms, as none but an enthuſiaſt in midwifery could ever have thought of, or can ever read without diſguſt and contempt. *Ab Jove principium; Jovis omnia plena.*—I hope I need not ſay that it is not the ancient Heathen Jupiter, but *Jupiter Lucinus*, the God of men-midwives, a modern Deity, whoſe ardent votary our author is.

He mentions, indeed, the various branches of medicine that are taught here, and the ſeveral profeſſors who teach them; and recommends ſome of them, and praiſes ſome of the profeſſors: which, in a work calling itſelf a Guide for Gentlemen ſtudying Medicine at the Univerſity of Ediburgh, could not be avoided. He mentions alſo mathematics, and even philoſo-

phy ; but ſtill midwifery, midwifery, midwifery, is always uppermoſt. His whole Pamphlet ſmells inſufferably of midwifery. *Omnia cum fecerit, Thaida Thais olet.*

3. J. Johnſon, Eſq; *muſt be* intimately acquainted with many of the moſt *recent* occurrences and eſtabliſhments in this Univerſity. The ſummer Clinical Lectures, and other ſummer courſes, Dr Duncan's Lectures on Medical Juriſprudence, Dr Rotheram being Dr Black's aſſiſtant, &c. He is alſo well acquainted with many minute particulars, eſpecially as to *money matters*, with reſpect to the lectures of the ſeveral profeſſors, and the attendance on the hoſpital, and the medical ſociety. But, above all, he appears to be moſt intimately acquainted with every thing relating to Dr Hamilton, the Profeſſor of Midwifery, and with his various *fees*, even to the mathematical preciſion of ſhillings and pence ; and with his way of teaching, and with the plan of his lectures, and with the extraordinary merit of them, and with their ſuperiority to all other lectures on the ſame ſubject ; and with the precious op-

por-

portunities which his pupils have of ſeeing the actual practice of midwifery, both in the public hoſpital and in private houſes; and with the *very great advantage* of becoming private or annual pupils of Dr Hamilton; which *very great advantage* is obtained by a few happy individuals, who pay him *ten guineas*. But our author feelingly remarks, "that this very great advantage "*unfortunately* can be extended but to "few." In ſhort, the chief aim of J. Johnſon, Eſq; in his Pamphlet, plainly is, to raiſe the fame, and promote the pecuniary intereſt of Dr Hamilton.

4. He tells us, that "Dr Hamilton *en-* "*gages* to furniſh his pupils with private "deliveries, if they are very anxious to "ſee much practice." This is the very language of an advertiſement; or at leaſt of one having, or thinking he had, authority, from Dr Hamilton, to promiſe and engage in his name.

5. He tells us, that the education of Dr Hamilton's ſon has been regulated with the ſole view of rendering him capable of the important taſk of aſſiſting his

father in teaching midwifery. This implies very intimate knowledge of their hiſtory, and of the actions, and even the thoughts and motives of Dr Hamilton.

6. Though J. Johnſon, Eſq; is ſo accurately informed of every thing relating to the midwifery claſs, and to Dr Hamilton, he appears to be moſt *wonderfully* ignorant of ſome things relating to the conduct of the profeſſors of medicine; and even of the public regulations, (called *Statuta Solennia*), with reſpect to the obtaining of degrees in phyſic in this Univerſity.

He tells us, (pag. 66. of his Pamphlet), that, " After having ſtudied at any other " medical univerſity, candidates for the " degree of Doctor of Medicine at Edin- " burgh are not obliged to attend the claſ- " ſes of that College above *two* years; " but they muſt take tickets from all the " profeſſors of medicine." To take tickets from them all, means to pay three guineas to each of them. The expreſſion, " are not obliged to attend the claſſes of " that College above two years," implies that they are obliged to attend them at leaſt

leaſt two years. J. Johnſon, Eſq; is notoriouſly wrong on both theſe points: for, firſt, ſtudents who have attended the lectures on medicine in other univerſities are not obliged to ſtudy here two years in order to obtain the degree of Doctor of Phyſic; and, ſecondly, ſuch ſtudents are not obliged to take a ticket from the profeſſor of any branch of medicine here, which they had ſtudied in another univerſity. Accordingly, to my certain knowledge, and that of all my colleagues, the profeſſors of medicine, and to that of many of our ſtudents, graduates, and others, many gentlemen have taken the degree of Doctor of Phyſic in this Univerſity, tho' they had ſtudied but one year with us; and though they had not attended the lectures of all the profeſſors of medicine, nor taken tickets from them all. Our laws relate to the time that they muſt employ in the ſtudy of phyſic, and to the various branches of it which they muſt ſtudy; not to the number of guineas that we may exact from them. It was the intention of the profeſſors of medicine who propoſed, and of the univerſity which ſanctioned thoſe laws, and it has been our uniform

practice

practice in the interpretation of them, to act in the moſt liberal manner to all other univerſities, and to all other profeſſors of medicine, as well as to thoſe ſtudents who came from them to us. J. Johnſon, Eſq; not knowing the fact, has repreſented us as doing the very reverſe, and as ſhewing the moſt ſordid attention to our own pecuniary intereſt. Any perſon may eaſily judge of the character of an author who could ſo ſhamefully, ſo ſordidly, miſconſtrue the following liberal, reaſonable, and juſt law, the ſecond of our *Statuta Solennia*.

" *Nemo Candidatorum numero aſcribatur*
" *priuſquam triennium, in hac aut aliâ A-*
" *cademiâ, Medicinæ ſtudio impenderit, et*
" *omnibus quas Scientia Medica complectitur*
" *Diſciplinis, ſcilicet* Anatomiæ *et* Chirur-
" giæ, Chemiæ, Botanicæ, Materiæ Me-
" dicæ *et* Pharmaceuticæ, Medicinæque
" Theoreticæ *et* Practicæ, *et* Prælectionibus
" Clinicis, *à Medicinæ Profeſſoribus habitis,*
" *de ægris in Noſocomio decumbentibus, ope-*
" *ram dederit.*"

Theſe

Theſe laws are made as public as poſſible: they are printed, and are in the hands of the ſtudents; for every candidate for degrees in phyſic receives a copy of them: And a copy of them hangs in the great library, to which all the ſtudents have acceſs.

I cannot ſuppoſe that J. Johnſon, Eſq; intended to miſrepreſent that law; for ſuch a miſrepreſentation could do no good either to him or to his friend, whoſe pecuniary intereſt he has ſo much at heart. I preſume he has only miſtaken the meaning of the law, which, though public enough and plain enough, unhappily for him, is in Latin.

III.

III.

NEXT to the enthuſiaſtic paſſion for midwifery, and the eager deſire to raiſe the fame and promote the pecuniary intereſt of Dr Hamilton, the moſt ſtriking and characteriſtic circumſtance in the Pamphlet of J. Johnſon, Eſq; is the extraordinary rancour which appears in it againſt thoſe perſons whoſe conduct has been diſobliging to Dr Hamilton, or whoſe intereſt is either eſſentially or accidentally inconſiſtent with his.

1. The principal object of this rancour is Dr Rutherford, Profeſſor of Medicine and Botany. The paſſages relating to him, and diſplaying that rancour, have been already quoted at full length, and need not be repeated. They are deciſive as to the ſen-

ſentiments and intentions of the author of the Pamphlet.

I ſhall make no attempt to refute the malevolent aſſertions and inſinuations of J. Johnſon, Eſq; with reſpect to Dr R. and his profeſſional character. In this city, and in this Univerſity, his character, in every reſpect, is too well eſtabliſhed to need or to admit of any vindication: and the great and increaſing numbers of the ſtudents who attend his lectures afford the moſt ample and honourable teſtimony of what his pupils think of him. But I ſhall mention what I conceive to be the reaſon of the inveteracy of J. Johnſon, Eſq; againſt him.

It happens, that Dr R.'s ſentiments with reſpect to midwifery in general, and to the male practitioners of it in particular, are widely different from thoſe of J. Johnſon, Eſq; and, to my certain knowledge, they have been expreſſed by him for many years paſt, both in public and in private, without any reſerve. Without entering needleſsly on the diſcuſſion of minute particulars, it will be ſufficient at preſent to mention, that four or five years ago, when the queſtion, Whether

men-midwives ſhould be admitted to be Fellows of the Royal College of Phyſicians, was under conſideration, Dr R. long and keenly oppoſed their admiſſion. I remember it well, and even the general tenor of his ſentiments, and his objections to their admiſſion, from this circumſtance, that he and I were on oppoſite ſides in that queſtion, and argued it fully, both in public, (at the College), and in private, with much keenneſs, though without any breach of friendſhip on either part.—Dr Home too was on the ſame ſide with Dr R. that is, againſt admitting the men-midwives to be Fellows of the College of Phyſicians: and he too is treated but ſcurvily, tho' not with the ſame inveteracy that Dr R. is treated, in the Pamphlet of J. Johnſon, Eſq;

Much more lately, indeed juſt about the time that the Pamphlet in queſtion was written, Dr R. did, what, I preſume, would be very diſpleaſing to our author and his friends. Dr R. is one of the Phyſicians of the Royal Infirmary; and when the Managers of that Hoſpital (tired, I believe, with frequent complaints of the abuſes and inconveniences connected with the

the lying-in ward which had been permitted in it) conſulted him about the propriety of continuing it or aboliſhing it, he gave a decided opinion for aboliſhing the lying-in ward; and, as I underſtand, it is to be aboliſhed accordingly. — In both theſe queſtions, man-midwifery in general, and Dr Hamilton in particular, were much intereſted. He was one of *two* men-midwives, who were deſirous to become Fellows of the College of Phyſicians, at the time the queſtion for reſcinding the law that excluded them was in agitation. He had formerly been of the College of Surgeons, but had got a diploma of M. D. (from the Univerſity of St Andrew's) ſome years before he obtained a licence from the College of Phyſicians.—And as to the abolition of the lying-in ward in the Royal Infirmary, that was a point ſtill more intereſting to him; for without ſuch a ward in the common hoſpital, or a particular lying-in hoſpital, he could not carry on that important plan of obſtetrical education which J. Johnſon, Eſq; recommends ſo eagerly. Accordingly Dr Hamilton has exerted himſelf ſo much in that good cauſe, as to have al-

ready obtained the inſtitution of a lying-in hoſpital, quite unconnected with the Royal Infirmary.

As the ſentiments and conduct of Dr R. on both thoſe points were open and avowed, I preſume they have been known to many perſons, eſpecially to thoſe peculiarly intereſted in them; and that J. Johnſon, Eſq; has taken umbrage at them. But I muſt do Dr Hamilton the juſtice to mention, that he declares that he knew nothing of them.

2. Our author is very unfriendly to the Profeſſor of Mathematics; and has made a moſt abſurd attack, not ſo much on him as on his academical profeſſion, which he endeavours to repreſent as uſeleſs and improper. At firſt view, it is not obvious what poſſible offence ſuch an obſtetrical Quixote could take at a ſcience, of which it is infinity to one that he knows not a ſingle propoſition; and with which, at any rate, he has no more to do than with Civil law or Church hiſtory. But the myſtery is fully explained by his own imprudence: in his laſt paragraph relating

to

to mathematics, he mentions, that " the " Mathematical Claſs in ſummer, in the " College of Edinburgh, muſt be perfect- " ly inconſiſtent with the views of medi- " cal gentlemen; for it meets at the ſame " hour with the Lectures on Midwifery, " which ought not to be omitted by any " ſtudent who remains in Edinburgh du- " ring the ſummer."——The reſt of the ſtory is, that Dr James Hamilton junior came to Mr Playfair, the Profeſſor of Mathematics, and, in the name of his father, the Profeſſor of Midwifery, requeſted of him to take a different hour for teaching mathematics, as he meant to teach midwifery at ten o'clock, the hour which Mr Playfair had choſen. This Mr Playfair, who thinks almoſt as highly of mathematics as Dr Hamilton and his Son do of midwifery, would not agree to.

Now, as it is an undeniable axiom in academics, that young men cannot ſtudy mathematics and midwifery at the ſame hour, and as Mr Playfair would not change his hour of teaching to gratify Dr Hamilton, and as his ſummer courſe of mathematics was peculiarly intended for the medical ſtudents, and had been re-

com-

commended to them accordingly by ſome of the Profeſſors, it follows by plain demonſtration, that the Elements of Mathematics, and eſpecially the *firſt ſix books of Euclid*, cannot be properly taught by a public profeſſor, but only by a private teacher, who will do it at leſs expence, and in a ſhorter time, better than any public profeſſor can do ; though, as appears by the laſt paragraph of J. Johnſon's Pamphlet, Natural Philoſophy, which involves the moſt difficult application of the moſt difficult part of mathematics, may be tolerably well taught by a public profeſſor. But then this Profeſſor's hour of teaching did not interfere with Dr Hamilton's.

It is certainly a very extraordinary diſcovery, that a thing cannot be done, which has been done eaſily times innumerable, and which is done ſucceſsfully every day : that a public profeſſor cannot teach the elements of geometry ; which are among the very few things that ſuch a profeſſor may teach without the poſſibility of error ; and in the learning of which, the example, the efforts, the emulation, of the ſtudents, in demonſtrating publicly the ſeveral propoſitions, are almoſt as uſeful as the

the lectures or other inſtructions of the Profeſſor.

I conſider J. Johnſon's diſcovery on that point, as the greateſt diſcovery that ever was made in the lower and hinder parts of mathematics. But there is reaſon to think, that Dr James Hamilton junior is well entitled at leaſt to ſhare with him the honour of it: For I have learned, from unqueſtionable authority, that, before the publication of J. Johnſon's Pamphlet in Edinburgh, Dr James Hamilton junior had expreſſed his opinion of the impoſſibility of acquiring a knowledge of mathematics in a public claſs; and had aſſured the gentleman from whom I have my information, that he had not been able to learn even the firſt elements of geometry in that way. Perhaps J. Johnſon, Eſq; had known this, and having profited as little by the inſtructions of the Profeſſor of Logic, as Dr James Hamilton junior had done by thoſe of the Profeſſor of Mathematics, had boldly ventured to draw a general concluſion from a particular inſtance.

3. Our author, in his Pamphlet, (pages 10. & 11.), expreſſes great inveteracy againſt

gainſt certain private teachers of anatomy, who have undertaken to furniſh their pupils with *private diſſections:* he even aſſerts that "they have only impoſed on the "world." A moſt wonderful impoſition it muſt be, if it be any impoſition at all; and they muſt be at leaſt magicians who practiſe it: for, granting that the noſes of the young anatomiſts might be deceived, or at leaſt puzzled, by honeſt phyſical means, and by ſubſtituting *quid pro quo*, ſurely nothing leſs than the black art could ſo faſcinate their eyes and fingers, as to make them believe they were diſſecting human bodies when they were not. As ſuch an impoſition is impracticable, and as an unſucceſsful attempt at it would inſtantly be found out, and would bring ſhame and ruin on the teacher who ſhould make ſuch an attempt, it was plain to me, that J. Johnſon, Eſq; muſt have had ſome other reaſon than honeſt indignation at ſuch an impoſſible piece of knavery for his peculiar inveteracy on that point. I was not in the leaſt at a loſs to underſtand his reaſon.

The only perſon now living, (ſo far as I know), to whom he can allude in that paſſage

paſſage of his Pamphlet, is an eminent ſurgeon and anatomiſt in this city; whom it would be indelicate for me to name, as J. Johnſon, Eſq; has not named him; and it is unneceſſary to do it, as it is abundantly well known who he is. I myſelf have but little perſonal acquaintance with him: but from all I have ſeen or heard of him, I believe him to be a man of talents, and a good anatomiſt; and I heartily acquit him of the charge of impoſition which our author has brought againſt him; but I cannot acquit him, nor can he clear himſelf, of a much worſe offence, and one which J. Johnſon, Eſq; was not likely either to overlook or to forgive. He is Dr Hamilton's rival in the *practice* and in the *teaching* of midwifery; and, as I underſtand, a very formidable and ſucceſsful rival: too formidable even to name.

There *was* another perſon, and, ſo far as I know, only one other perſon, to whom J. Johnſon, Eſq; could be ſuppoſed to allude in that ſevere cenſure of the private teachers of anatomy. That perſon has been dead theſe two years and more; but when alive he too was Dr Hamilton's ri-

val in the practice and in the teaching of midwifery.

4. It is curious at leaſt, and, as I think, in ſome meaſure inſtructive, to obſerve how J. Johnſon, Eſq; treats the private teachers of medicine in Edinburgh.

He begins by acknowledging that " ſome of theſe by their abilities have " been admitted into the College;" (*Pag.* 40.) Dr Hamilton himſelf was long a private teacher of midwifery, before he was made Profeſſor of it in the Univerſity.

But he (J. Johnſon, Eſq;) immediately proceeds to expreſs in the plaineſt terms his diſapprobation of private teachers, and cautions gentlemen very ſtrongly againſt attending their lectures in preference to thoſe of the profeſſors. He even endeavours (after expreſſing his impartiality, and the neceſſity of explaining the matter) to prove *a priori*, that the Profeſſors evidently will be men of abilities, and that their lectures " muſt be *at leaſt equal* " to thoſe of any private teacher;" (*Pag.* 41. & 42.) He even admoniſhes gentlemen, that, " in a political view, no pri-

" vate

" vate teacher ought to be preferred to " the profeſſor; for as the world is apt " to judge of the abilities of medical men " by the opportunities of acquiring know- " ledge which they have poſſeſſed, the " gentleman who has attended *eminent* " *teachers*, will always be preferred by the " judicious part of mankind."

Another of his arguments to the ſame purpoſe is much more abſurd than this one, and even makes againſt his own concluſion. But it would be worſe than hereſy for a profeſſor to controvert his doctrine on this ſubject; and it is unneceſſary, as an anonymous writer in the Gentleman's Magazine for November 1792 has done it ſufficiently. It will be obſerved, that Dr Hamilton is now, and has long been a Profeſſor in the Univerſity.

Let it be obſerved too, that J. Johnſon, Eſq; notwithſtanding his ſtrong diſlike to private teachers, in the very next page (the 43d of his Pamphlet) warmly invites, and aſſures of good encouragement, a private teacher of Botany, in oppoſition to the Profeſſor.

5. Even the poor midwives in Edinburgh (the female midwives I mean) ſeem ſomehow to have incurred the diſpleaſure of J. Johnſon, Eſq; for he mentions them (*Pag.* 32.) with a ſort of contempt and reproach ; " as midwives are almoſt exclu-
" ſively employed in *low life*, in Edin-
" burgh, and as many of them are very
" ignorant, difficult caſes occur in a great
" proportion." Who but a Male Practitioner of Midwifery in Edinburgh could know or judge of thoſe things ? Who elſe could have any motive for publiſhing ſuch an aſſertion ?—Dr Hamilton and his Son are Male Practitioners of Midwifery in Edinburgh.

IV.

IV.

ANOTHER curious circumſtance in the Pamphlet of J. Johnſon, Eſq; is the very laviſh diſtribution of praiſe which he makes among thoſe whoſe conduct has been obliging to Dr Hamilton, or who are connected by ſome bond of friendſhip either with him or with his Son. I am not enough acquainted with his connections and his private hiſtory, to know whether this be the caſe in *every* inſtance of praiſe beſtowed by him, as the oppoſite conduct has been with reſpect to thoſe whoſe behaviour had been diſobliging to him; but I am ſure it is ſo in ſeveral ſtriking inſtances. If it had been univerſal, it would not have been blameable: ſuch liberal praiſes might be ſuppoſed only expreſſions of our author's genuine ſentiments. But, either

as

as univerſal or only as general and remarkable, that kind of correſpondence may be inſtructive, and may ſerve to ſhew the intimacy and relation between the nominal and the ſuppoſed author of the Pamphlet.

1. I am be-praiſed very liberally. — "When I am praiſed by a bad man, ſaid "*Antiſthenes*, I am troubled to think what "ill I have done."—I ſhould have been puzzled at leaſt, if not troubled, to gueſs how I had merited the praiſes of J. Johnſon, Eſq; if I had not read at the ſame time his ſtill more liberal praiſe of Dr Hamilton, and his rancorous attack on Dr Rutherford, and on the private teachers of anatomy, and on the public Profeſſor of Mathematics. But with the help of ſo full a context, I thought I underſtood it perfectly.

My conduct in the College of Phyſicians, when the queſtion about admitting the men-midwives to be Fellows was in agitation, had been diametrically oppoſite to Dr R.'s. I fought their battle with great keenneſs; and I was ſucceſsful. The conſequence was, that ſoon after, Dr Hamilton,

ton, and, very lately, his Son, were admitted Fellows of the College. When I congratulated Dr H. on his admiſſion as a Fellow, the firſt time he appeared in the College in that capacity, I had his particular thanks for my good offices to him. Theſe thanks I underſtood to be for my conduct when the general queſtion was agitated; for it was no ſecret, and had procured me expreſsly the thanks of another perſon who was in the ſame predicament with Dr H. and, like him, deſirous to become a Fellow of the College. But when I mentioned the occurrence (in preſence of Dr H.) to a committee of the Univerſity appointed to confer with him and me about J. Johnſon's Pamphlet, he declared that he knew nothing of ſuch conduct of mine. When I reminded him of his acknowledgement of particular obligation to me at the time of his admiſſion, he explained that it was for having ſeconded the motion for his being admitted a Fellow; which, it ſhould ſeem, he was informed of, though not of what had paſſed before. I believe he is right as to my having ſeconded the motion for his admiſſion, though I myſelf had forgotten it; and, for the purpoſe

poſe at preſent in view, it is of no moment whether it was in the one or the other, or in both of theſe ways, that my conduct had been peculiarly obliging to Dr H. ſo as to procure me his thanks.

I can ſay with great confidence as to myſelf, what I cannot preſume to ſay with reſpect to the other perſons whom our author has thought fit to praiſe, that the praiſes which he has beſtowed ſo liberally are not his genuine ſentiments. This will appear in ſome meaſure, even from that letter of his which I have publiſhed in the ſequel of theſe Remarks; for in it he declares himſelf well acquainted with numerous deficiencies in my lectures, and ſeems to be well diſpoſed to make them known. In another letter of his, dated at *Benares*, but bearing the London poſt-mark of 15th January, and the Edinburgh poſt-mark of the 18th January laſt, and received by me the ſame day with Dr James Hamilton's ſecond letter, which he has had the goodneſs to print, J. Johnſon, Eſq; avows the ſame ſentiments and intentions in ſtill ſtronger terms, and takes care to let me know, that he thinks me a very ſhallow Fellow. This obliging information

mation he gives me (ſtrange to tell) in the words of *Perſius: Tecum habita, noſti quam ſit tibi curta ſupellex.* Poſſibly ſome learned Bramin, more learned perhaps in Latin than in the Shanſcrit, has helped him to that ſcrap of erudition. Such being his genuine ſentiments with reſpect to me, all the praiſes which, in his Pamphlet, he has laviſhed on my abilities, and my lectures, and my book, muſt have proceeded from ſome other principle; and moſt probably from one correſponding to thoſe which have prompted the reſt of his work. ——I hope the Royal College of Phyſicians will forgive the liberty I take, which perhaps is not ſtrictly regular, in mentioning thus publicly the tranſactions and debates in their ſociety. They were at any rate very well known; the knowledge of them can injure no one: nor can any perſon be ſuppoſed to be aſhamed of the part he took in that debate to which I have alluded.

2. Dr Monro is praiſed very highly, and perhaps very honeſtly, and at leaſt very deſervedly, by J. Johnſon, Eſq;

Dr Monro is the choſen friend and patron of Dr Hamilton, as appears by the dedication of his work on the Management of Female Complaints, &c. which was publiſhed but a few months before J. Johnſon's Pamphlet, and is dedicated to Dr M. in terms of the higheſt admiration, reſpect, and regard.

3. Dr Duncan is praiſed very highly and deſervedly, perhaps honeſtly too, by J. Johnſon, Eſq. Dr Duncan is a particular friend of Dr James Hamilton junior, as appears by the preface to the laſt volume of his Medical Commentaries, in which he ſays, "For this tranſlation," (viz. of the new medical conſtitution propoſed for the kingdom of France), "I am indebted "to an ingenious young friend, Dr James "Hamilton, ſon to Dr Alexander Hamil-"ton, Profeſſor of Midwifery in the U-"niverſity of Edinburgh, whoſe induſtry "and abilities are already ſo well known, "and have been demonſtrated on ſo ma-"ny occaſions, even at his early period "of life, that his reputation can derive no "addition from the mention of his name "on the preſent occaſion."

A friend in need, ſay the vulgar Engliſh, is a friend indeed; and ſuch a friend is Dr D. to Dr James H. junior. That preface is dated December 1. 1792, about a week after Dr James H.'s formal diſavowal of the Pamphlet in his letter to Dr R. and Dr R.'s dry anſwer to it; and at a time when very ſtrong and general ſuſpicions were entertained of his being concerned in the compoſition and publication of J. Johnſon's Pamphlet; and near ten days before I propoſed that an enquiry ſhould be made into the origin of it, and ſtill longer before I mentioned thoſe very particular coincidences (ſtated in the following Section of theſe remarks) which have been thought ſtrongly to confirm the ſuſpicions previouſly entertained.

4. Our author praiſes, in the higheſt terms, Mr Stewart the Profeſſor of Moral Philoſophy, as "a man of the firſt abi-" lities, *perhaps*, in the Univerſity of E-" dinburgh;" and very warmly exhorts the ſtudents of medicine to attend his

ſummer courſe of lectures. (Pamphlet, P. 73.)

I ſhall throw away that ſilly *perhaps*, and ſay with confidence, that we are all ſenſible that the talents and virtues of Mr Stewart do honour to our Univerſity; and I heartily ſecond the recommendation of Mr Stewart's lectures: ſincerely hoping that every ſtudent of medicine, and every other ſtudent who attends them, ſhall profit more by them than J. Johnſon, Eſq; ſeems to have done; whom probably neither Mr Stewart, nor Chryſippus, nor Crantor, nor Homer, nor Socrates could ever have taught, *quid ſit pulchrum*, *quid turpe*, *quid utile*, *quid non;* as the whole tenor of his Pamphlet amply teſtifies.

On the ſame ſtrong internal evidence (of his own compoſition) I ſhould ſay with equal confidence, that he could no more judge of Mr Stewart's abilities, nor underſtand his lectures, than the *fœtus in utero* could do.—But he certainly could underſtand *ten guineas* as well as *Ariſtotle* himſelf could have done, as plainly appears from what he ſays of Dr Hamilton's annual (that is *ten guinea*) pupils. Now

ten

ten guineas is the exact ſum which Mr Stewart ſubſcribed to the lying-in hoſpital, which Dr Hamilton has been labouring hard to eſtabliſh ever ſince it was determined by the Managers of the Royal Infirmary, that the Lying-in ward, long permitted in that Hoſpital ſhould, be aboliſhed.

5. Dr Rotheram (Dr Black's aſſiſtant) is praiſed very highly by J. Johnſon, Eſq; and very juſtly, I acknowledge, for he is really a man of merit. But it has been thought, that, in this inſtance, as in ſo many others, our author had ſome private reaſon for the praiſes he beſtows ſo liberally.

Dr Rotheram, in a publication to which his name is not prefixed, took occaſion to mention a book of Dr Hamilton's writing in a manner highly gratifying to the author, and at a time when ſuch favourable mention of the book was of *very peculiar* conſequence to it, and to Dr H. Dr H. was informed by the bookſeller who was concerned in the tranſaction, and who was himſelf uſeful on the occaſion, by clearing

clearing up an unlucky miſtake about it, that it was to Dr Rotheram he owed that favour.

When I mentioned this in the Committee of the Univerſity, 22d December 1792, as the ſuppoſed private reaſon of the praiſes beſtowed on Dr Rotheram, in the Pamphlet, (*Pag.* 20.), Dr Hamilton declared he had never heard of the buſineſs. I ventured to ſay, that I could not be miſtaken about it, for I had got my information from Mr Creech, (the bookſeller concerned in the tranſaction), in preſence of Dr Rotheram himſelf, who gave the very ſame account of it.

Dr Hamilton declared, that he had not ſpoken to Mr Creech for three months. That, I told him, might very well be, for the affair to which I alluded paſſed more than a year ago. I ſhould have been nearer the truth if I had ſaid three years ago. I have ſince converſed very fully about it both with Mr C. and Dr R. from whom I have learned many other particulars of the ſtory; and a very curious one it was. But it ſhould ſeem that Dr H. had ſomehow forgotten it.

Now,

Now, all theſe circumſtances taken together, the eager deſire to raiſe the fame and promote the intereſt of Dr H. the accurate knowledge of ſo many minute particulars relating to his lectures, and even to his family hiſtory; the remarkable favour to thoſe whoſe conduct has been friendly to him; the uniform malignity againſt thoſe whoſe conduct has been diſobliging to him, or whoſe intereſt was inconſiſtent with his; plainly ſhew, that the author of the Pamphlet muſt be at leaſt an intimate and confidential friend of Dr H. *Namque idem velle atque idem nolle, ea demum firma amicitia eſt.*

His attachment to Dr H. ſeems to be more than friendſhip; more even than the veneration and duty of a pupil to his inſtructor; for neither pure and honeſt friendſhip, nor veneration and gratitude towards a teacher, ſo far as I know, ever yet produced ſuch conduct as his. I think he might almoſt ſay to Dr H. in the ſublime and pathetic words of the affectionate *Ruth* to one who was not her parent: "Intreat me not to leave thee, or to re-

"turn

" turn from following after thee: for
" whither thou goeſt, I will go; and
" where thou lodgeſt I will lodge; thy
" people ſhall be my people, and thy God
" my God."

V.

V.

THE circumſtance in the Pamphlet under conſideration, which ſoon decided my opinion with reſpect to the real origin of it, was the finding, that in the paſſages already quoted in praiſe of Midwifery and of Dr Hamilton's Lectures, our author expreſſed the very ſame ſentiments, and, in ſeveral remarkable inſtances at leaſt, employed the very ſame words and phraſes to expreſs them, which Dr Hamilton himſelf had employed many years before, when in a very angry mood, and on a very particular occaſion, he diſcuſſed that ſubject with me. Nay more, I found that he had adopted and even executed the very intentions of Dr H. with reſpect to a certain enquiry, which Dr H. at that time, in a very unguarded manner, and with

the utmoſt violence of paſſion, had told me that he *muſt* make. The ſubject of this enquiry is the ſtate of the Profeſſor of Midwifery in the Univerſity of Edinburgh, who is not conſidered as a Profeſſor of Medicine, and whoſe claſs the ſtudents are left at liberty to attend or not as they pleaſe; attendance on it not being required to entitle them to be admitted to examination as Candidates for the degree of Doctor of Phyſic. This point, it may be believed, is very intereſting to the Profeſſor of Midwifery; and it appears to be no leſs ſo to J. Johnſon, Eſq; for he ſtates his enquiry about it in very keen and almoſt rancorous terms, conveying indirectly a compliment to Dr H. and very directly a ſevere cenſure on the Profeſſors of Phyſic, and on the Patrons of the Univerſity.

Theſe things I can aſſert with confidence from my own immediate knowledge; but in order to explain them properly, I muſt mention the tranſactions which gave occaſion to ſuch a converſation between Dr H. and me.

In 1783, in conſequence of certain occurrences which are fully ſtated in the Records of the Univerſity, but which it is needleſs here to detail, it was thought proper to publiſh, in the Engliſh newſpapers, a tranſlation of our Laws, with reſpect to the time and courſe of ſtudy required before any of our ſtudents can be admitted to examination as Candidates for the degree of Doctor of Phyſic, and with reſpect to the examinations which they muſt undergo, and the various exerciſes which they muſt perform before they are promoted to that degree.

The Principal, who, with his uſual zeal for the honour and intereſt of the Univerſity, had ſuggeſted this plan, and explained the propriety of it, obligingly undertook, himſelf, the taſk of tranſlating thoſe Laws, and illuſtrating them by a ſhort commentary, which was certainly needed to ſome of them. This paſſed at a meeting of the *Senatus Academicus* in September.

At the annual meeting of the Univerſity, in the beginning of December, the Principal read his tranſlation of the *Statuta Solennia*, and his commentary on them,

which were unanimouſly approved of, and ordered to be publiſhed.

They were publiſhed in the newſpapers accordingly very ſoon after; I believe either in the end of December 1783, or in January 1784.

A few days after they were publiſhed, Dr Hamilton, with whom I was and am ſtill but very ſlightly acquainted, and who, I believe, never was in my houſe either before or ſince, came to my houſe in an agitation of mind and body that cannot be deſcribed, nor indeed conceived by any but thoſe who have chanced to ſee him in ſuch a ſtate.

He complained, in the moſt violent terms, of the *injury* and *injuſtice* that I had done him, and *inſiſted* on immediate reparation by publiſhing anew the account of our Laws. At firſt I could not conceive what he meant, and was very much aſtoniſhed at his behaviour: but I ſoon found out his meaning, and the ſuppoſed injury which had made him ſo angry. —— In the paper that was publiſhed there was not one word about Midwifery: it had been totally forgotten. This omiſſion he ſuppoſed to have been wilful and malicious;

cious; in which opinion he was completely miſtaken. His anger was particularly directed againſt me, becauſe he thought *it was all my doing*; this too was a miſtake, but it was a very natural one, which the former was not.

I was at that time the youngeſt Profeſſor of Medicine, and of courſe Dean of the Faculty, which, in plain Engliſh, means Secretary for the Medical Department in the Univerſity. It was natural enough for Dr H. to ſuppoſe that the tranſlation and explanation of the laws was my work, and conſequently that the omiſſion of the Midwifery Lectures was my fault. Undoubtedly the taſk would have been either mine or the Secretary's of the Univerſity, moſt probably mine, if the Principal himſelf had not voluntarily undertaken it; for none of us could have deſired him to undertake it.

As ſoon as I diſcovered the nature of Dr H.'s miſtake, and the cauſe of his anger at me, I endeavoured to undeceive and pacify him, by aſſuring him, that the omitting to mention his Claſs was not intended, but proceeded merely from forgetfulneſs; and that, at any rate, I had

no

no concern in it, as it was not my work. But in this attempt I could not ſucceed. He would ſcarce liſten to me, or, if he did liſten, ſeemed not to believe me: perhaps he thought it impoſſible that we ſhould have really forgotten his claſs, which to himſelf appeared of ſuch importance; and the declaring that we had forgotten it muſt have appeared to him a kind of inſult.

I tried to explain to him that the publication he complained of as my doing was the ſolemn act and deed of the Univerſity, the tranſlation and commentary being the work of the Principal, and having been read and approved of at a regular meeting.

I remember telling him, that it was his own fault not to have attended to it when it was read there. He ſaid, he was not at the meeting, and could not be at it, being called to a very urgent caſe. That, I told him, was his misfortune; and ſtill endeavoured, but in vain, to convince him that he ought not to blame me for what I had no concern in; nor any body, for mere unintended omiſſion. He repeatedly urged the injury done to him, and *inſiſted* (for this was always his word) on

on having the Paper immediately reprinted, and his Claſs mentioned in it, by way of reparation.

I told him, that if ever the Paper was republiſhed, care ſhould be taken to mention his Claſs in it. But this would not ſatisfy him; he would have it done immediately. This I did not approve of, and told him ſo. My reaſon was, that our Claſſes had been advertiſed in all the newſpapers, in the uſual way, in September and October; then, in two months after, another and much longer advertiſement or manifeſto of ours had made a conſpicuous figure in them: to have repeated this ſo ſoon, and to be perpetually in the newſpapers, I ſhould have thought ridiculous and diſgraceful, as being too like to the practice of mountebanks.——I tried to convince Dr H. that to reprint our Paper, merely to mention in it his Claſs, would be an injury and not a favour to him, as it would be juſt telling all the world, that his Claſs was of ſo little importance, that we had all forgotten it. This made him more angry than before; and he declared with great vehemence, that *it was all ſophiſtry*; which expreſſion,

as

as well as my argument that led to it, and the general tenor of this converſation, it appeared at the conference, December 22. 1792, that he remembered perfectly.

As he ſtill returned to the charge, maintaining, that he had been greatly injured, that it was all my doing, and that it was very hard that I refuſed to do him juſtice, and always *inſiſted* on having the Paper republiſhed immediately, and his Claſs mentioned in it; and as Dr G. unfortunately, as well as Dr H. has ſome portion of the iraſcible in his compoſition, I became warm as well as he, and told him in a different tone, that he had no reaſon to complain, and no right to inſiſt on having the Paper republiſhed, and his Claſs mentioned in it; that there was no occaſion to mention his Claſs in that Paper, which was not an account of all the Claſſes taught in the Univerſity of Edinburgh, (like our annual newſpaper-advertiſement), but a tranſlation of our laws reſpecting Candidates for Degrees in Phyſic, and the courſe of ſtudy required of them, and the examinations that they muſt undergo, and the exerciſes that they muſt perform; and bid him remember, that

that they were not obliged to attend his Claſs, nor ſtudy midwifery unleſs they pleaſed.

That ſuch was and is the caſe will ſufficiently appear from the Law already quoted (*Pag.* 30. of theſe Remarks); which will alſo ſhew that the Principal was not in the leaſt blameable for the omiſſion of Dr H.'s Claſs in the paper. Nor was it in order to throw any blame on him, but, on the contrary, to convince Dr H. that no body was to blame, that I was at ſo much pains to make him underſtand that the paper was not my work, but the Principal's.

Things were very bad before; but this unlucky argument of mine made them much worſe. Dr H. told me inſtantly, and with the utmoſt vehemence, that he knew *that*;—that it was very extraordinary, that it ſhould be the only Medical Claſs that they were not obliged to attend, when it was one of the moſt important of them;—that he muſt *enquire* into *that*. Then he burſt forth into an oration of ſome length, I believe not leſs than three or four minutes, delivered with great fluency and vehemence, in praiſe of mid-

wifery, and of his own lectures. The general tenor of this oration was precisely the same with that of the part of the Pamphlet which relates to midwifery, and to Dr Hamilton's lectures.

At the distance of nine years it is impossible for me to remember every topic that he touched on, or any great number of the peculiar expressions that he used. But two or three of them I remember distinctly; partly perhaps from their oddity, and partly from my having been very much struck with the whole scene and conversation. I remember well the sentence containing the happy antithesis between the state of midwifery when confined to *women*, at which time it was but a mechanical art, and the state of it since *gentlemen* were employed in it.

He told me, that it was now greatly improved, and become an extensive science; and said much of the complete and scientific view that he gave of it in his lectures, which he declared roundly to be much more extensive and scientific than any other teacher's, as he gave in them a full account of the diseases of women and children. I remember well the curious alliteration and ob-

ſtetrical climax of *the pregnant, parturient, and puerperal ſtate*, which I find in the Pamphlet, with an additional word, *unimpregnated*, prefixed to them. That no doubt makes both the alliteration and the climax more complete: but as I do not remember it as part of the expreſſion which ſtruck me ſo much at the time I heard it, I ſuſpect it has been added more lately. But it may only have eſcaped my memory.

All Dr H.'s arguments and eloquence were loſt on me: I adhered to my firſt opinion; and on his ſaying, that he would bring it before the College, and telling me that the other Profeſſors would do him juſtice though I would not; and again inſiſting peremptorily, that he would have the paper reprinted, and his Claſs mentioned in it, I told him flatly, that it ſhould not be done if I could hinder it. This put an end to our converſation; and Dr H. went away more diſpleaſed, if poſſible, at me than he had been when he came.

By that ſingular accident, and by Dr H.'s complicated miſtake, firſt, in ſuppoſing himſelf injured, when in fact he was

not; next ſuppoſing that imaginary injury done intentionally, when, in truth, it was purely accidental; then ſuppoſing me the author of it, when, in fact, I had nothing to do with it; then applying to me for redreſs, whoſe ſentiments were totally different from his own, and whoſe every argument intended to appeaſe and convince, ſerved only to provoke him; I, who know very little of Dr H. chanced to know as well as his moſt confidential friends could do, his enthuſiaſm about midwifery, his opinion of the importance of it as a branch of medicine, his admiration of his own lectures, his indignation at not being conſidered as a Profeſſor of Medicine, and his intention of enquiring into *that*; nay, I knew even the words and phraſes he uſed to expreſs his ſentiments on theſe points.

Great was my aſtoniſhment, and no leſs my indignation, to find, on reading the Pamphlet, that the author of it had adopted the ſame ſentiments and expreſſions, and even executed the ſame intention. It appeared to me *impoſſible* that this ſhould have happened without the moſt confidential intercourſe between him and Dr H.; and

and very *improbable*, that any perſon, ſo much in his confidence, and ſo eager to promote his intereſt, ſhould have made ſuch an uſe of what he had learned from him, without his knowledge and participation. This notion too accorded perfectly with every particular of internal and circumſtantial evidence, which either occurred to me on reading the Pamphlet, or has become known to me ſince, by ſubſequent enquiry.

Such a coincidence, though not ſtrictly ſpeaking legal *proof* of Dr H. being concerned in the compoſition and publication of the Pamphlet, was at leaſt ground of irreſiſtible ſuſpicion; and, as I ſhould have thought, of ſtrict judicial enquiry.

Whether Dr H. had been informed of my having mentioned that curious converſation, and of the uſe I intended to make of it, as a part of the circumſtantial evidence which I had undertaken to ſtate; or whether he had recollected it of his own accord, I know not; but I am ſure he had been thinking of it before I mentioned it in his preſence in the Committee of the Univerſity, December 22. 1792; and I ſuſpect, that he was well aware

of

of the very particular relation between it and what is ſaid in the Pamphlet on the ſubject of midwifery. For as ſoon as I mentioned the occaſion and date of that converſation, and referred to the Univerſity record (which I had taken care ſhould be at hand) for the hiſtory of the tranſaction that led to it, he interrupted me with much keenneſs, and gave his own account, at ſome length, of the converſation, and of my conduct to him. He expreſſed his regret that he had not brought with him a certain letter about it, which he had written at the time, but had not ſent to the Principal, for whom it was intended. I am ſorry the letter was not produced: It muſt be a genuine and authentic document of what were his ſentiments on that occaſion; and, making due allowance for his complicated miſtake, I have no doubt but it will accord perfectly with the account which I have given of what paſſed between us, and which I gave in his preſence to the Committee; and no one particular of which he choſe to controvert.

He mentioned, however, and ſeemed to lay great ſtreſs upon one particular of that con-

converſation which I had not mentioned, becauſe, in truth, I had not the leaſt remembrance of it. He ſaid, he had applied to the other medical profeſſors, (whether he meant ſome or all of them I know not), and that they had agreed to allow the paper to be immediately reprinted, and mention to be made in it of his Claſs; and that it was I alone who oppoſed it.

This, no doubt, gives a different view of the buſineſs, and muſt make me appear more blameable, or at leaſt more harſh in my conduct to him, than I had thought myſelf. But I truſt the whole of my conduct in this affair, and particularly my ſtating the particulars (in ſo far as I remembered them) of that converſation, in his own preſence, that he might ſet me right, if he thought I miſrepreſented any part of it, will exempt me from the ſuſpicion of having wilfully ſuppreſſed any circumſtance that might be thought unfavourable to myſelf, or favourable to him.

The converſation itſelf was ſo very extraordinary, that it is impoſſible either Dr H. or I could forget it: it was, I think, the moſt extraordinary that ever paſſed in my houſe; and more like a ſcene in a ludicrous

dicrous comedy or novel, than like any occurrence in real life. But, after ſo long a time as nine years, I cannot be ſure that I remember every particular of a very angry converſation that laſted at leaſt ten minutes or a quarter of an hour; though I am ſure I well remember the general tenor, and many of the particulars of it.

That particular, of the other profeſſors having agreed to what Dr H. required, may have eſcaped my attention at the time; or may have eſcaped my memory ſince. It accords very well with his violence of paſſion againſt me, and his *inſiſting* ſo often on what he required, as a matter of right and juſtice to him. But it does not ſo well accord with his ſuppoſing me the author of the injury done to him: for all my colleagues knew perfectly that I had no concern in the compoſition of that unlucky paper; and none of them, I am ſure, could be ſo malicious as either to lead him into ſuch a miſtake, or even to encourage him, or allow him to remain in it, if it was originally his own; which, from the whole tenor of his converſation and conduct, I firmly believed it to be.

It

It is very ſtrange too, that Dr H. when he found the other profeſſors willing to gratify him, or, as he conceived, to do him juſtice, and me alone obſtinate, unreaſonable, and unjuſt, on that point which he had ſo much at heart, did not bring it before the Univerſity; as at one time he ſeemed fully determined to do. Even in the Faculty of Medicine there would have been five to one, and in the *Senatus Academicus* perhaps twenty to one, againſt me and in favour of him: ſo that my opinion and my oppoſition would have availed nothing.

However, I am ſenſible that neither theſe conſiderations, nor my *not* remembering that very important particular, of ſome or all of my colleagues having agreed to Dr H.'s requeſt, can reaſonably be put in oppoſition to his poſitive aſſertion of it from diſtinct memory; eſpecially when his memory is aſſiſted by ſo good and authentic a document as that letter which he intended to have ſent to the Principal. Perhaps that letter, which is ſtill extant, may explain fully what to me appears ſo ſtrange and incongruous.——I therefore admit it to have been as Dr H. ſtates it:

and I ſhould certainly have mentioned it at firſt, if I had known or remembered it.

In the Committee of the Univerſity, (December 22. 1792), Dr H. mentioned another very curious particular, which was quite new to me, and, I believe, to all my colleagues, in relation to the candidates for degrees in phyſic not being obliged to attend the Midwifery Claſs: that is, in other words, midwifery not being deemed an eſſential part of the education of a phyſician. He told us, that Dr Young (his predeceſſor, who took him in as his colleague and ſucceſſor) had informed him how that matter ſtood, but ſaid, he hoped it would ſoon be put on the ſame footing with the other medical claſſes. This converſation, which was prior to Dr H.'s admiſſion as Profeſſor, muſt have been in 1780, at leaſt three years before the time of the unlucky paper which gave him ſuch cruel offence, by the omiſſion of the Midwifery Claſs. We may be certain, therefore, that he had long had much at heart that enquiry which he told me ſo vehemently he *muſt* make, and which J. Johnſon, Eſq; actually hath made in ſuch rancorous

corous terms. " Does this proceed from " the jealouſy of the other profeſſors, the " negligence of the Profeſſor of Midwife- " ry, or the ignorance of the Patrons of " the Univerſity?"

The " negligence of the Profeſſor of " Midwifery" is quite out of the queſtion, even according to our author's own account of the matter; for he gives a true, full, and particular account of Dr H.'s extraordinary diligence, in reading no fewer than three courſes of lectures every year, teaching at *extra hours*, taking annual pupils, &c. That query, therefore, is only a compliment to the Profeſſor.

But the other two queries are no compliments, either to the other Profeſſors, or to the Patrons of the Univerſity.

As to any jealouſy of the other profeſſors, I can ſafely declare that I never felt any ſuch jealouſy, nor ever ſaw nor ever heard of any thing that indicated any ſuch jealouſy of Dr H. in any of my colleagues. I cannot even conceive the poſſibility of any ſuch jealouſy on our part; we have not the ſame object of attachment with him; we are not his rivals, nor is he

 ours;

ours; we are not engaged in the practice nor yet in the teaching of midwifery. If Dr H. or any other profeſſor of midwifery, by his extraordinary talents and unwearied diligence, ſhould contribute more to raiſe the reputation of this medical ſchool, than all the profeſſors of medicine that ever have been in it, and more than *Boerhaave* did at Leyden, or *Hippocrates* at Cos, it would be no loſs to any of us; but, on the contrary, a very great advantage: it might, and certainly would gain him our eſteem and good will; but never could excite our jealouſy.

Nor yet can I admit, that the Patrons of the Univerſity are juſtly charged with ignorance in not making the Profeſſor of Midwifery a Profeſſor of Medicine; and in allowing, as the Univerſity does, the ſtudents of medicine and candidates for degrees to attend his lectures or not as they pleaſe.

Without flattery to them, and without attributing to them any ſupernatural knowledge, we may ſuppoſe them to know that phyſic and midwifery are two very different things; which may be learned and practiſed by perſons of very different capacities

capacities and educations, nay, even of different ſexes; that it is juſt as poſſible for a man to be a good phyſician without being a midwife, as it is for a diſcreet ſober woman who hath born three or four children, to be a good midwife without being a phyſician. They may even have known, that the moſt eminent phyſicians, both in ancient and modern times, from *Hippocrates* to *Dr Cullen* inclusive, were not midwives. They may even have conceived that *Dr Cullen*, whoſe talents contributed ſo much to raiſe and ſupport the character of this medical ſchool, and on whoſe ſkill they relied when health and life were at ſtake with themſelves or their families, would have made almoſt as bad a figure, if called on to play the midwife's part, as a good motherly woman of a midwife would do, if ſhe were dreſſed in his gown and wig, and placed in his academic chair, and deſired to teach the theory and practice of Phyſic.

As the practice of midwifery by men is very faſhionable, and as many who receive their medical education here may chooſe to practiſe midwifery, and as every perſon ſhould learn what he intends to practiſe,

practiſe, it is very proper that there ſhould be a Profeſſor of Midwifery, and that the ſtudents ſhould have every opportunity of learning it. But, as many of our ſtudents never mean to practiſe midwifery, it would be unreaſonable and unjuſt to compel them to learn it; more eſpecially, as, notwithſtanding the influence of faſhion, there are many young men to whom it is peculiarly diſguſting; and many wiſe and good men, and women too, of all ages, to whom the practice of midwifery by men is an abomination, which degrades the character of the one ſex, and ſullies the purity of the other. Many Phyſicians even are of this opinion. The Royal College of Phyſicians in London does not admit as a Fellow any man who practiſes midwifery. A licentiate in phyſic may practiſe midwifery without forfeiting his general medical licence; but, I believe, they have licentiates for midwifery only, who are not entitled to practiſe phyſic.

The Royal College of Phyſicians of Edinburgh has (of late years) allowed them to become Fellows; probably for various reaſons, which it is needleſs here to conſider. I ſhall only ſay, that I eſpouſed

their

their cauſe, not from any eſteem I have for their art, which I never ſtudied, becauſe I was reſolved never to practiſe it; but becauſe I hate all invidious diſtinctions, and every thing that has the appearance of an illiberal corporation ſpirit; and becauſe I can ſee no good reaſon why thoſe men who pretend to help folk into the world, and thoſe who pretend to keep them in it, or, as the malevolent preſume to ſay, who help them out of it, may not live on good terms with one another, and from time to time drink a glaſs of Claret together, "To the memory of their deceaſed Bene-"factors."——Beſides, I am clearly of opinion, that it is not for phyſicians, but thoſe who employ them, to decide who are to be deemed phyſicians. If people choſe to regard not only male but female midwives as phyſicians, and to call them Doctors, I think we ſhould gain neither honour nor advantage by diſputing the rights and privileges of the learned ſiſters.

As I heard no more of Dr H.'s peremptory demand of reparation, nor of any application from him to the Univerſity on the ſubject of the printed paper, I took it for

for granted, that either his own deliberate reflections, or the admonitions of ſome of his colleagues to whom he might have liſtened more than he did to me, had convinced him that my arguments againſt republiſhing it immediately were not juſt ſuch *Sophiſtry* as he was pleaſed to call them: but as he never made any apology to me for his ſtrange and almoſt outrageous behaviour, which moſt men would have thought it neceſſary to do after ſuch conduct as his, if they were convinced they had been in the wrong, I doubted whether he had ever been convinced how egregiouſly he was miſtaken in ſuppoſing that I had ever injured or intended to injure him. But ſtrange as his conduct was, it certainly could neither juſtify nor produce any ſerious or permanent reſentment on my part; and I am perſuaded that my conduct towards him in the College of Phyſicians, (which was near four years after the other affair), muſt have convinced Dr H. that I entertained no ſuch ſentiments towards him.

WHEN I was firſt informed of the general ſuſpicion or belief entertained among our ſtudents, that Dr H. was concerned in the compoſition and publication of the Pamphlet of J. Johnſon, Eſq; I was told, that this opinion was founded partly on the ſtriking ſimilarity of ſeveral ſentences, and of many words and phraſes in it, to thoſe uſed by him in his lectures; as well as on the general tendency of it to raiſe his fame and promote his intereſt, and to injure thoſe whoſe intereſt was inconſiſtent with his.——This raiſed my curioſity to get a ſight of a copy of his lectures; but I could not procure one. One gentleman who had heard of the general obſervation, but who could not ſpeak to it from his own knowledge, at my deſire, applied to ſome gentlemen, who were qualified to judge of it, to mark ſome of the ſentences and phraſes that they recogniſed as Dr H.'s.

They marked accordingly the ſentence beginning, "When the practice," *Pag.* 26. of the Pamphlet, *Pag.* 3. of theſe Remarks; the one about the importance and expence of his preparations, *Pag.* 27. of the Pamphlet, *Pag.* 4. of theſe Remarks; and the one

containing the climax of " the unimpreg-
" nated, pregnant, parturient, and puer-
" peral ſtate ;" Pamphlet *Pag.* 72. Remarks, *Pag.* 13.

The peculiar phraſes ſpecified as currently uſed by Dr H. in his lectures, are, " Healing art," and " Practitioners of the " healing art," for phyſic or medicine, and phyſicians, " advanced ſtudents," " extra " hours ;" all which are uſed *paſſim* in the Pamphlet.—No perſon, however, ſo far as I could learn, recogniſed the *enquiry*, (of which ſo much has been already ſaid), as occurring in Dr H.'s lectures.

I need ſcarce ſay, that many perſons, eſpecially authors and public ſpeakers, are as well known by their peculiar favourite words and phraſes, as they are by their faces, perſons, or voices. But I muſt mention, in juſtice to Dr H. that he admits theſe words and phraſes to be what he uſed in his lectures, and the minute detail given of the plan of them to be accurate, and what he gives himſelf ; and accounts for theſe things appearing in the Pamphlet, on the very ſimple and eaſy ſuppoſition, that ſome one of his pupils who had learned them by attending his lectures,

was

was concerned in the compoſition of the Pamphlet.

His calculation, (which he ſtated fully, both on the 22d of December, in the Committee, and on the 1ſt of January, in the *Senatus Academicus*), was, that as he gives three courſes of lectures in a year, and as many ſtudents remain here three years, ſome of them may have heard his lectures nine times, particularly the introductory lecture, in which the plan of his courſe is detailed.

The calculation is exact; and the ſuppoſition (or indeed much leſs, the hearing three or even two courſes, nay, even one courſe) fully accounts for the poſſibility of a perſon's remembering his moſt frequent expreſſions and moſt remarkable ſentences. But the difficulty is, to explain how any perſon, having no intereſt to ſerve nor paſſions to gratify by ſuch conduct, ſhould ever think of making ſuch an uſe of his acquiſition, and writing ſuch a Pamphlet as J. Johnſon, Eſq; has done.—Beſides, our author muſt not only have written down or got by heart the words and phraſes of Dr H. about his own lectures, but muſt alſo have made him his model for ſtyle

and compoſition: for the ſame phraſes, "Healing art," &c. occur in parts of the Pamphlet that do not relate to midwifery, and never could have made a part of Dr H.'s lectures. See Pamphlet, *Pag.* 1. 14. 15. 17. 21.

THE Preface to the laſt volume of the Medical Commentaries ſtrongly excited my curioſity to read the tranſlation by Dr James Hamilton junior, of the propoſed French Medical Conſtitution, and to compare the ſtyle of it with that of the Pamphlet of J. Johnſon, Eſq; Though the one is a tranſlation and the other an original compoſition, yet, either from the force of prejudice, or from ſome real ſimilarity between them, I was much ſtruck with many coincidences, not in expreſſion only, but in thought and ſubſtance. I ſhould not ſcruple to give it as my opinion, that the French Medical Conſtitution is the prototype of the "Guide," and firſt ſuggeſted the general plan of it, and even

many

many particulars of the train of thought, which J. Johnſon, Eſq; gives as his own.

Such a general obſervation, like the perception of likeneſs among living perſons, is too vague to be either refuted or eſtabliſhed preciſely; it may ſtrike different people very differently. But to ſhow that it is not altogether groundleſs, I ſhall point out a few particulars of the coincidence or reſemblance both in ſtyle and thought, which cannot admit of diſpute.

" The healing art," and " Practition-
" ers of the healing art," occur more frequently in the French Medical Conſtitution, even than in the Pamphlet; ſometimes twice in a page; and at leaſt eleven times in the firſt eight pages; how much oftener afterwards I cannot tell, having ſatisfied my curioſity, and tired of counting the frequency of it. In one place (*Pag.* 181. of the volume, 7th of the paper, *l.* 21.) it ſeems plainly to be a cloſe tranſlation of ſome French phraſe, I ſuppoſe *l'art de guerir*; it may be ſo in every other place of that paper; but ſurely it is not a tranſlation from the French in the Pamphlet of J. Johnſon, Eſq; in the very firſt ſentence of which, and in ſeveral o-

thers,

thers, the unlucky " healing art" makes a conſpicuous figure.

As ſpecimens of the coincidence in point of thought, as well as of expreſſion, between the French Medical Conſtitution, as tranſlated by Dr J. H. junior, and the Pamphlet of J. Johnſon, Eſq; I ſelect the following paſſages.

" It will not be conſidered improper to require, that the Profeſſor of *Materia Medica* ſhould alſo teach botany, not only in a botanic garden containing the uſual officinal plants, and in the fields, but alſo in hot-houſes, to make the pupils acquainted with the exotic plants uſed in medicine." *Medical Commentaries*, *vol.* 17. *p.* 203. 204.

Let any one compare that with the paragraphs of the Pamphlet, bottom of page 12. and top of page 14. (quoted verbatim in page 14. line 10. and page 15. line 16. of theſe remarks), and he will inſtantly perceive, that the ſentiments of J. Johnſon, Eſq; are taken from the French Conſtitution, and adapted to the meridian of Edinburgh.

The

The ſame reflection will occur to any perſon who ſhall compare the following paſſages relating to the mode of teaching the Practice of Phyſic,—

" The Profeſſors of the Practice of Medicine ſhould teach that great and noble ſcience in its full extent.

Their courſes ſhould occupy two years; one of which ought to be appropriated to acute, and the other to chronic diſeaſes; but they ſhould give theſe courſes by turns; ſo that, while one is employed in detailing the treatment of acute diſeaſes, the other ſhould be engaged in treating chronic ones. By this plan, the ſtudents will have an opportunity of attending a complete courſe every year." *Med. Com. vol. 17. p. 206.*

—with what is ſaid of my lectures, and my mode of proceeding, in the Pamphlet, *Pag.* 33. and 34; quoted already in theſe Remarks, *Pag.* 20. & 21.——J. Johnſon, Eſq; had been very imperfectly and erroneouſly informed of what I had done, and what I had left undone; and is completely

pletely miſtaken with reſpect to my ſuppoſed plan and intentions; but this point I ſhall not inſiſt on, as it is not worth while to ſet him right.

But the moſt curious and edifying kind of affinity, is that between the general plan and courſe of ſtudy propoſed in the French Medical Conſtitution, (*Med. Com. p.* 239. & 240.), and the various plans and courſes of ſtudy propoſed by J. Johnſon, Eſq; for thoſe who ſtudy phyſic in the Univerſity of Edinburgh; (Pamphlet *Pag.* 54.—68.). The paſſages are much too long to quote, and I therefore refer the curious to the original work.

By the French plan, the courſe of ſtudy was to laſt ſix years. This J. Johnſon, Eſq; knew would never do for Edinburgh.

In the French plan, very little is ſaid of midwifery; much leſs indeed than I ſhould have expected. By it, the ſtudents are not even to begin the ſtudy of midwifery till their fourth year. This, it is plain, would never do for J. Johnſon, Eſq;

Accordingly he has taken effectual care to ſupply that lamentable defect, by exhorting his followers to begin, continue, and

and end with the ſtudy of midwifery. And as to the ſix years courſe of ſtudy, with wonderful dexterity he has contrived to haſh it into various forms, which are detailed in two different claſſes and ſix different tables, as he calls them, which are accompanied and enforced by ſuitable remarks and exhortations. Yet ſtill it is eaſy to ſee whence the general notion of ſuch directions is borrowed.

VI.

J. JOHNSON, Eſq;'s Dedication of his Pamphlet is dated from London; but there is reaſon to think, that this is part of the ſame ſhallow artifice with the falſe name on the title page. Every circumſtance about it, the language of it, the general purpoſe and tendency of it, the minute knowledge of many recent occurrences in this Univerſity which it ſhews, all concur to prove that it is an Edinburgh production.

Of this, moreover, I have poſitive information. When enquiry was made about it of Meſſ. Robinſons, (the London publiſhers), one of the younger partners, the only one whom the attorney found in their ſhop, told him that they had it from their correſpondent at Edinburgh; that he

he ſhould make no difficulty in giving the name of the author; but he added, that he wiſhed firſt to conſult his partner, who knew more of the buſineſs than he did. He was allowed till next morning to conſider of it. That day, November 28. 1792, the elder partner wrote to the attorney, telling him, that he really did not know the name of the author of the Pamphlet; that it had been put into his hands by a friend to be publiſhed; that his friend was at a great diſtance from London; that he himſelf was going down to Bath, and ſhould not be back till December 14th; that if by that time he could gain the deſired information, he ſhould have no heſitation in giving it, &c.

The attorney wrote to him again, December 3d, repeating and urging the enquiry, and received for anſwer, "That "being from home, he did not ſee his "(the attorney's) letter till that moment; "that if he had ſeen it before, he could "not have given him an anſwer ſooner; "—declared upon the word of a man, "that he did not know the author of the "Pamphlet in queſtion; that it was put "into his hands by a gentleman who does

" not wiſh to be known in the buſineſs, " and therefore he could not give him " up." This letter is dated December 5. 1792. There was therefore abundance of time between November 28th, and the day when it was written, for the Meſſ. R. to write to their correſpondent in Edinburgh, and to receive his anſwer and inſtructions.

It is at leaſt poſſible, that a London bookſeller's correſpondent in Edinburgh may be an Edinburgh bookſeller. It is poſſible even, that, in the preſent caſe, the correſpondent may be one of the four Edinburgh bookſellers whoſe names appear on the title-page of the Pamphlet. And this poſſibility is rendered ſomewhat probable with reſpect to one of them, by the fact, (of which I am well aſſured), that ſome very intereſting information about the hiſtory of the Pamphlet had tranſpired from his ſhop before any alarm was taken about it, and when it was only an object of merriment and curioſity. The intelligence to which I allude was ſo particular, as to imply the knowledge of the origin of the Pamphlet a conſiderable time before it was publiſh-

ed

ed here. But as it is not at all of the nature either of internal or of circumſtantial evidence, it can have no place in theſe Remarks: nor indeed can it be properly eſtabliſhed and made effectual but by a judicial examination of the perſons through and from whom it came to me.

FOR

FOR the knowledge of the following particulars, I am indebted to a gentleman on whom I can perfectly rely: and who, though nowiſe ambitious to appear in this buſineſs, is ready, when judicially called upon, to declare on oath all that he knows about it.

To this gentleman Dr James Hamilton junior hinted one day laſt autumn, that he had already publiſhed more than one pamphlet or book without his name; and certainly ſaid, that he ſhould ſoon appear before the public in that way.—This converſation paſſed about the end of September or beginning of October; that is, near a month before "the Guide" was publiſhed here.

A few days afterwards, Dr J. H. junior ſhewed this gentleman a copy of "the "Guide," inſcribed "from the author," and allowed him to peruſe it.

No

No other converſation paſſed between Dr J. H. junior and this gentleman on the ſubject of the Pamphlet till about the beginning of December, when Dr J. H. one forenoon, told the gentleman that he (Dr H.) had been accuſed of having written it; that he was exceedingly hurt with the imputation, and requeſted of him to contradict it, if ever he heard it mentioned.——The gentleman adviſed him to do that in a much more effectual way, by applying to the real author, J. Johnſon, Eſq; through the medium of the London publiſhers, and requeſting him to ſtand forth on the occaſion.——Dr H. ſaid, "that "his father had objected to his doing this, "as Dr Rotheram had alſo been vaguely, "but, he thought, unjuſtly pointed at." —He added, "that the author might poſ- "ſibly have received ſome hints reſpecting "the preſent publication, from his father "or himſelf, by means of ſome informa- "tion which had been conveyed to a "friend in London." He alſo hinted his ſuſpicion, that the report might have come from Mr Hill or his men: and ſaid, he wondered how *he* could be ſuſpected of being the author, as his time was ſo fully occu-

occupied with the tranſlation of Morgagni, the anſwer to Dr Oſborn, the Medical Conſtitution of France, &c.

On theſe particulars I make no commentary; leaving it to every reader to judge for himſelf.—The converſation, I obſerve, paſſed at leaſt a week after Dr H.'s formal diſavowal of the Pamphlet in his letter to Dr Rutherford, which he hath printed, and as long before I moved in the *Senatus Academicus* for an enquiry into the origin of it.

VII.

VII.

ON the 24th of December 1792, I had the very great and very unexpected pleaſure of receiving a letter from J. Johnſon, Eſq; It was directed, Dr Gregory, Profeſſor of Medecine, [*Medicine*], Edinburgh. The tenor of it was as follows:

Pater-Noſter Row, Dec. 18. 1792.

"SIR,

YOUR office induces me to apply to you, on the ſubject of the unfortunate Pamphlett [*Pamphlet*] which has given ſo much uneaſineſs. I deſigned to offend

no one *; I wrote what I had ſeen and heard; but I did not write the whole truth, for I could have ſaid things much more offenſive, without in the leaſt deviating from its paths. But this is from the purpoſe: as it has given offence, which I did not intend, as it is ſuppoſed to injure ſome whom I reſpect *, I have given orders to ſtop the ſale, and you will hear no more of it.

What my motives may be for this ſtep, you need not know. It does not proceed from apprehenſion, for I am not even moſt remotely connected with the Univerſity. My fortune cannot be affected by the reſult of any verdict; and my practice, eſtabliſhed on a well-grounded confidence, you cannot injure. In ſhort, I am, in every view, out of your reach. If malevolence had actuated me, I ſhould be amply gratified by your purpoſed proſecution; for every literary journal ſhould record the trial, every Profeſſor ſhould be ſubpeenad [*ſubpœna'd*] to give his evidence, and ample proofs ſhould be produced of numerous deficiences, of defi-

* See Page 14.—18. of theſe Remarks.

ciences,

ciences, Sir, even in *your own* Claſs. If I wiſhed to raiſe one Profeſſor over another, the attempt would, I know, have failed from its weakneſs: The idea would have been abſurd. Yet I ſee this, with other marks of equally unfounded illiberal abuſe, attributed to me in the laſt Gentleman's Magazine, a publication which thoſe who know how it is conducted, will beſt know how to value.——I ſhall not imitate your *friends*, by retorting abuſe in the language of Bilinſgate [*Billingſgate.*]

Such is the ſtate of the circumſtances, and I would requeſt you to weigh them well. If I have injured any one, I am ready to make any reparation for the injury.—But, I own, I feel the warmeſt indignation, when I reflect on the language and the conduct it has occaſioned.—For you in particular, I have been uſed to feel a ſincere * reſpect; and when the circumſtances make a myſtery no longer neceſſary, a period not far diſtant, you will find me your real friend, and an old acquaintance.

J. JOHNSON.

* See Page 48. and 49. of theſe Remarks.

Since I now write to you as Secretary, I muſt requeſt that this letter be communicated to the Committee."

The wonderful jumble of reproaches, of flattery, of threats, of declarations which it is impoſſible to believe, of profeſſions of contrition for paſt miſdeeds, and of intimations of further miſchief which he has in view, contained in this letter, afford an admirable ſample of the underſtanding and character of J. Johnſon, Eſq; But they are too bad for animadverſion. Some other things in his letter deſerve more attention.

He muſt have been minutely informed of the part I had taken, and of what the Univerſity was doing, with reſpect to his Pamphlet. He knew the language and conduct it had occaſioned: that is, my language and my conduct, when I expreſſed in very plain terms my ſentiments of the turpitude of it, and mentioned the general opinion that prevailed as to its origin, and propoſed that a ſtrict enquiry ſhould be made in order either to eſtabliſh or refute that opinion. He felt "the warm-

"eſt

" eſt indignation" at that language and conduct: yet not ſo warm as to make him ſtand forth, either to take vengeance on me, or to vindicate his friends, whoſe fame and fortune he was ſo eager to raiſe, from that foul ſuſpicion which they had ſo unhappily incurred: on the contrary, it only made him ſuppreſs his Pamphlet, and employ all his eloquence to prevail on me to deſiſt from my propoſed enquiry. Theſe are more like the effects of cold fear and conſcious guilt, than of warm indignation.

He knew of the appointment of the Committee of the Univerſity to confer with me and Dr H. about the Pamphlet. Whether the blunder of ſuppoſing me Secretary to it be his own or his informer's I know not, nor does it ſignify. He requeſts me to communicate his letter to the Committee. This implies, that he thought his letter would reach me in time; that is, before the meeting of the Committee. This again implies, that he knew when the Committee was to meet. His information ſeems to have been very accurate, and wonderfully early, earlier by a day than mine was, though I was ſo much

much intereſted in the buſineſs, and was in the college every day. The Committee met (as ſummoned) on Saturday 22d December 1792. He ſeems to have known of this intended meeting on the preceding Tueſday, the 18th, which is the date of his letter. If his letter had come in due courſe of poſt from London, I ſhould have received it on Friday the 21ſt, the day before the meeting of the Committee, and then I might have complied with his requeſt by communicating it as he deſired. But I did not receive it till Monday the 24th, two days after the Committee had met, and conferred with me and Dr H. and agreed on its report: ſo that it was impoſſible for me to comply with his requeſt.

Between the 18th, the date of the letter, and the 24th, the day on which I received it, is twice the time required for a letter to come by poſt from London to Edinburgh; or, in other words, juſt the time required for one to go by poſt from Edinburgh to London and return to Edinburgh. Such I inſtantly gueſſed had been the very eccentric orbit of the letter of J. Johnſon, Eſq; But wiſhing to get all the

inſight

inſight I could into the matter, I applied to the Secretary of the General Poſt Office in this city, and begged to know how it came to paſs that a poſt-letter from London ſhould be ſix days of coming to Edinburgh. On examining the date, and the poſt-marks on the outſide of it, he immediately aſſured me that there was no irregularity in the conveyance of it, in ſo far as the Poſt-Office was concerned. He ſhewed me that it bore the London poſt-mark of the 21ſt December 1792, teſtifying that it came into the General Poſt Office there that day, and not before; and that it bore the Edinburgh poſt-mark of December 24. teſtifying that it came into the General Poſt-Office here that day, in due courſe from London. To have reached London on the 21ſt, it muſt have left Edinburgh before four o'clock in the afternoon of the 18th, under cover, no doubt, to ſome confidential friend in London.

That it related to the approaching meeting of the Committee on the 22d of December, I can have no doubt; for the only two days ever mentioned for its meeting were that Saturday, and, as I and others

thers had underſtood, the preceding one, the 15th of December. The Committee was appointed on Monday evening, December 10. The Principal mentioned at that time, that it muſt meet on Saturday, the Profeſſors being ſo much engaged every other day. *That* I *bona fide* believed to mean Saturday next enſuing. But the Committee was not ſummoned to meet that Saturday; and it was afterwards (January 1. 1793) explained to me, that it meant only *ſome* Saturday.

It is plain, that J. Johnſon's letter was not intended for the meeting of the Committee on the Saturday firſt ſuppoſed to be meant, however accurate, and authentic, and early his intelligence of it might be; for the date of his letter is three days later than it, and three days more would have been required for it to come from London to Edinburgh. But, according to its date, it ſhould have reached me the very day before the Committee was at laſt to meet, and is plainly intended to influence the proceedings of the Committee. Without the moſt particular information, he could not have known or ſuppoſed, that ſuch a Committee would be ſo long of meeting

meeting on ſuch an urgent piece of buſineſs, which might be done in an hour or two as well as in a month.

I think it *probable*, therefore, that, on Tueſday December 18. J. Johnſon, Eſq; had ſomehow learned that the Committee was to meet on Saturday the 22d, and knowing there was time between Tueſday and Saturday for a letter to come from London to Edinburgh, wiſhed to avail himſelf of his knowledge, and try his eloquence on us, to make us drop the propoſed enquiry or proſecution; that, in his great wiſdom, he falſified the place of writing, by inſerting Pater-Noſter Row, (the place in London where his bookſellers the Robinſons have their ſhop), inſtead of Edinburgh; but in his great hurry (of which indeed the compoſition of his letter amply teſtifies) forgot to falſify the date of it, and by miſtake wrote the real date of it; and that he forgot to calculate, or perhaps did not clearly underſtand, that from Edinburgh to London, and back again to Edinburgh, is twice as far, and, in courſe of poſt, takes twice as long time, as ſimply from London to Edinburgh. The conſequence of his firſt

miſtake was, that his date and the poſt-marks differ by three days ; of his ſecond, that I did not receive his letter till two days after the Committee had met, and agreed on its report.

It is yet a matter of ſome difficulty to conceive how J. Johnſon, Eſq; came to know, even in Edinburgh, on the 18th, in time for the London poſt, that the Committee was to meet on the 22d of December. I did not know it on the 18th ; and actually wrote a letter to the Principal that evening, begging to have the earlieſt notice of the meeting of the Committee, that I might arrange matters ſo as to be able to attend it. Next morning I received his anſwer, informing me, that *before* he received my letter he had given orders to ſummon the Committee to meet on Saturday the 22d.

Having heard that Dr H. had been much diſpleaſed at the Committee not meeting, as was expected, on Saturday the 15th, and had even made a very *ſtrong* application to the Principal about it, I thought it poſſible that he might have known a day or two ſooner than

I did when the Committee was really to meet.

At the meeting of the *Senatus Academicus*, January 1ſt, it was aſcertained by the Principal's anſwer to a written query of mine, which the Secretary read, that he had received a very *urgent* letter from Dr H. on that ſubject, *after* which, and in conſequence of it, though he meant to have done it at any rate, he had ordered the Committee to be ſummoned to meet on the 22d of December. He did not mention, nor did I aſk, whether he had anſwered Dr H.'s letter or not. But from the Principal's well eſtabliſhed character for good ſenſe, good manners, and knowledge of the world, and attention to the duties of his ſtation, there can be no doubt that he anſwered it immediately, and in the moſt ſatisfactory manner; and that it was *after* receiving Dr Hamilton's letter, and *before* receiving mine of Tueſday December 18th, that he ordered the Committee to be ſummoned to meet on Saturday December 22.

I then read to the *Senatus Academicus* J. Johnſon's letter, which I had no opportunity of reading to the Committee; and,

after a few dry remarks on the date and poſtſcript and poſt-marks of it, concluded with theſe words, (referring to the happily emphatic expreſſion of one of my colleagues on a former occaſion), " I ſhall not ſay " that there is a *Judas Iſcariot* among us, " but I ſay with confidence, there is a " *Judas Iſcariot* very near us, who has " early intelligence of what paſſes among " us."—A propoſition which I have not hitherto found any perſon inclined to diſpute.——J. Johnſon, Eſq; will underſtand perfectly, and may explain whenever he pleaſes, why I mention here that peculiar expreſſion.

Dr Hamilton declared, that the letter " was all a myſtery to him."

J. Johnſon Eſq; in his great hurry of writing that letter, and his exultation in the belief that " he is in every reſpect out " of my reach," has dropped a hint that deſerves attention, becauſe it ſuggeſts ſome eaſy and natural *enquiries*. " My " practice, eſtabliſhed on a well-ground- " ed confidence, you cannot injure." I have no doubt that he thinks it eſtabliſh-

ed

ed on well-grounded confidence; and I can aſſure him, that, if I could, I would not injure his practice; for I take no concern in it. But by his own account this Eſquire is engaged in practice, which indeed appeared very plainly by the internal evidence of his Pamphlet. By the ſame evidence it muſt appear clearly, (I mean to the private conviction of every individual, though perhaps not as a matter of legal proof) that the place of his practice muſt be Edinburgh, and the *line* of it midwifery.

His boaſt of well eſtabliſhed practice completely refutes the *ſuppoſition* at one time ſtated, that the Pamphlet was the work of *ſome ſtudent*. To that ſuppoſition, as being both vague and gratuitous, I believe no regard was ever paid. Probably there is not a ſingle ſtudent at the Univerſity, who would not diſclaim with honeſt indignation ſuch a ſuppoſition if made with reſpect to himſelf or his companions. But, from the whole ſpirit and tenor of the Pamphlet, it is plain that in the author of it, the ſacred fire of youth had either never burned, or had ſoon been ſmothered by

by the ſordid rancorous paſſions of maturer years.

The field of enquiry is much limited by J. Johnſon's account of his own practice, and the irreſiſtible implication with reſpect to the kind and the place of it. The number of ſuch practitioners in Edinburgh is but ſmall, and their characters and their connections are pretty generally known. Every one of them muſt be either connected with Dr H. or not connected with him.

If J. Johnſon, Eſq; be *not* connected with Dr H. (I mean connected with him by the ſacred bond of intereſt), he can be no fit object of animadverſion or enquiry; and his calamitous ſituation muſt ſoon make him generally known. The poor man muſt be deemed *felo de ſe*, unleſs it can be proved, that he is *non compos mentis*, for taking ſo much trouble, and publiſhing a Pamphlet of ſuch turpitude, as to require the uſe of a falſe name, and every poſſible precaution to prevent his being known; and all this to raiſe the fame and promote the intereſt of a rival practitioner.

Such

Such conduct, though not phyſically, is morally impoſſible; it is as contrary to the moral, as living on ſtones, or falling headlong to the clouds are to the phyſical nature of man: and as incredible, as that J. Johnſon, Eſq; merely out of a frolic, and without any enmity to himſelf, ſhould bite his own noſe off: which, I have been told, was the plea ſet up, and even ſworn to by two witneſſes, in vindication of a man who, in a broil, had done that extraordinary injury to his adverſary.

If J. Johnſon, Eſq; be connected with Dr Hamilton, he muſt be either his Son, Dr James H. junior, or not him. *He* diſavows moſt ſolemnly any concern in the Pamphlet; we muſt therefore ſuppoſe it written by ſome other perſon. Now, if this were ſtated to one hundred people, probably ninety-nine of them would ſay, "Then who the Devil can that "perſon be?"

As the publiſhers either could not, or would not anſwer that queſtion, I thought the moſt likely way to obtain a ſatisfactory

factory anſwer to it would be by a *proper* application to J. Johnſon himſelf; ſuch an application I mean, as ſhould *induce* him to appear, or at leaſt to ſpeak out, in *propria perſona*. This I attempted in the following manner.

VIII.

VIII.

HAVING been favoured with ſo acceptable and edifying a letter from J. Johnſon, Eſq; it was plainly incumbent on me to return him a proper anſwer to it: and an anſwer I did return him accordingly, of a very extraordinary kind; not to be paralleled by any of the letters of *Cicero* or *Pliny*, nor even to be matched by any thing in that valuable work called the Complete Letter Writer. It was in every reſpect a truly original production; and, without vanity be it ſaid, a very good one: but, if it ſhould ever make its appearance, it muſt not be judged of by any common rules of criticiſm. It was good, in my opinion at leaſt, as being well adapted for the purpoſe it was intended to ſerve, which was a very uncommon one: it was

neither to make the perſon who ſhould receive it laugh nor cry; neither to make him wiſer nor to make him better; neither *prodeſſe* nor *delectare*, but quite the reverſe; to provoke him to fury, to alarm him with the apprehenſion of the probable bad conſequences of his Pamphlet to himſelf in his real character and perſon, which I endeavoured to ſhew him were abundantly well underſtood; and to drive him to ſome abſurd public exhibition or exploſion, in *propria perſona*, that either by itſelf, or in concurrence with other circumſtances, might make him generally and indiſputably known.

I intended and expected, that my letter ſhould operate on him as the touch of *Ithuriel*'s ſpear did on the toad at the ear of *Eve:* and ſure I am, that if there had been but half a grain of gun-powder in his whole compoſition, he muſt have gone off like a ſky-rocket before he had read it to the end.

My letter was directed moſt preciſely to J. Johnſon, Eſq; Author of "the Guide," and contained the moſt pointed anſwer to his letter, almoſt ſentence by ſentence, and a few general remarks on the whole of it, and

and on his own character and conduct; ſo that it was impoſſible it ſhould affect any perſon, or be applied to any one that was not concerned, either as principal or acceſſory, in the compoſition of that letter and Pamphlet. But if my letter ſhould have "wandered, Heaven directed," to Dr James Hamilton junior, which I own I thought much more than poſſible, then he muſt have found himſelf diſſected and anatomized in a moſt horrible manner. He muſt alſo have found in it the moſt cogent reaſons (at leaſt the moſt cogent that I could think of for him) to induce him to try ſome expedient, if poſſible, to take vengeance on me, and at leaſt publicly to vindicate his own character, and to prevent ſome of the evils with which he was threatened.

A legal proſecution of me was ſurely the moſt obvious expedient; but my letter, for many reaſons, was hardly oſtenſible; and if it had been produced, he could found no action on it, nor have any cauſe to complain of it. What is it to Dr J. H. junior what I ſay to J. Johnſon, Eſq; of himſelf, in anſwer to his letter to me? Dr J. H. junior could not even acknow-

ledge having ſeen that letter, (in which, to the beſt of my remembrance, neither his name nor his father's is mentioned), without ſhewing that he was in habits of the moſt confidential intimacy and correſpondence with the author of the Pamphlet; which would go near to eſtabliſh for ever the opinion ſo generally entertained from the firſt, that he had ſome concern in that work.——Beſides, there might be many other reaſons, eſpecially the embarraſſing affair of the judicial examination of witneſſes, for not making my conduct the ſubject of legal proſecution. An appeal to the public was ſeemingly free from thoſe inconveniencies and dangers; and might be carried no farther than ſhould be deemed expedient.

My aſſertion, that what I ſaid to J. Johnſon, Eſq; in anſwer to his letter was adapted to produce a public anſwer or exploſion, not from him under his aſſumed name, but from Dr J. H. junior in his own name, is ſo ſtrange a paradox as cannot be believed till it is explained, which may eaſily be done by a ſingle ſpecimen. —In his letter to me he ſays, "I am not "even moſt remotely connected with the "Uni-

" Univerſity." My anſwer to that part of his letter (as nearly as I can remember) was as follows: " It is true, at leaſt in one " ſenſe of the words, that you are not e- " ven moſt remotely connected with the " Univerſity; and it ſhall be my ſtudy " to prevent you from ever being more " nearly connected with it." Of the propriety of ſuch ſtudy with reſpect to the author of the Pamphlet and letter in queſtion, whether his name were J. Johnſon or not, there could be no doubt. I leave it to the candid and intelligent reader to judge how ſuch a hint was likely to operate.——Much more to the ſame purpoſe was ſaid in anſwer to his vaunt, that he is in every view out of my reach.

Such being the general purpoſe and tenor of my letter, I think it may be reckoned good, in the ſame way that we reckon ipecacuanha and rhubarb, though very nauſeous drugs, good medicines; they are good for their ſeveral purpoſes, and accordingly, in certain circumſtances, might be recommended to an Alderman of London, nay, to my Lord Mayor himſelf, as better than veniſon or turtle, Champaign or Madeira.

My

My letter was ſent under cover to the Meſſ. Robinſons, the London publiſhers of the Pamphlet, whom I begged to forward it, if they could, to J. Johnſon, Eſq; and, if they could not tranſmit it to him, to ſend it back to me. The latter part of it (for it was too big to go all in one frank) went from Edinburgh January 3. as the former part had done January 1. Neither part of it was ſent back to me; I preſumed, therefore, that the whole went in due courſe to J. Johnſon, Eſq; The latter part of it could not have reached London till Monday the 7th, no poſt entering that city on Sunday. In courſe of poſt it might have reached its deſtination in Edinburgh on the 10th; but as the packets were very bulky, I thought it poſſible that Meſſ. R. might either wait a day or two to procure franks for them, or ſend them down by the ſtage-coach, as is often done with Reviews and Magazines, or get the opportunity of ſending them hither by ſome perſon coming to Edinburgh; ſo that the ſecond part of my letter might not reach Edinburgh till two or three days after the 10th.

No

No exploſion happening for ſeveral days after the time that I expected it, I began to ſuſpect that J. Johnſon, Eſq; had diſcovered my intention; and to fear that I ſhould be totally diſappointed in my plan, from which I had entertained ſuch ſanguine hopes.

But I was not diſappointed. On the 17th of January (pretty late in the evening) I had the pleaſure of receiving that letter from Dr J. H. junior which he hath printed. Judging from the tenor of it that my letter to J. Johnſon, Eſq; was likely to operate, I took care that my anſwer to Dr J. H. which he hath alſo printed, ſhould co-operate with it. I had inſtantly formed an opinion about the real cauſe of the ſtep he had taken, but I was unable to form any conjecture about the oſtenſible cauſe that he could aſſign for it. My propoſed judicial enquiry (which had been at an end more than a fortnight before) related not to him, (who was no wiſe ſubject to academical authority or cenſure) but to his Father, a member of the Univerſity, whoſe conduct was ſurely ſubject to the review of the Univerſity, and of the Patrons of it. The expreſſion

in

in his letter, " I am told that you ſtill " perſiſt in alledging, that the work origi- " nated from me," &c. plainly refers at leaſt to ſomething very *recently* ſaid by me, if not to a *frequently* and *recently* repeated act or habit. But from the time that the Univerſity had diſmiſſed the enquiry, which coincided with the time of ſending the firſt part of my letter to J. Johnſon, Eſq; I had, for very obvious reaſons, carefully avoided the ſubject; and from firſt to laſt I had been peculiarly careful not to hazard any ſimple poſitive allegation (implying direct and immediate knowledge) with reſpect to the origin of the Pamphlet. I had been at pains to explain to my colleagues and others that I had no ſuch direct knowledge, and that my conviction on that point was founded on the ſtrong internal evidence of the Pamphlet itſelf, and on many concurrent particulars of circumſtantial evidence of which I had certain knowledge. I thought it poſſible, that ſome people who had told Dr J. H. of my conduct, had not duly attended to that preciſion and diſtinction, which I explained, or at leaſt tried to explain fully to him in

in my anſwer to his letter. But he did not chooſe to underſtand me.

Still however I was at a loſs to gueſs how my letter to J. Johnſon, if it had reached its deſtination, and was to operate at laſt, ſhould be ſo long of operating as from the 10th or 12th to the 17th of January. But next forenoon this was in ſome meaſure explained to me. Meeting the poſt-man on the ſtreet, I received from him, along with ſome other letters, a reply from J. Johnſon, Eſq; but without any ſubſcription: this defect I imputed to his not quite reliſhing the way that I had choſen to read his initial J. my letter, at the end, having been addreſſed to Judas Johnſon, Eſq;

This reply is dated, " *Benares*, in the " 1850th year of the æra of *Bikramajit*:" to preclude, I ſuppoſe, any further remarks, ſuch as thoſe I had given him on the place and date of his former letter. But *Cælum non animum mutant, qui trans mare currunt.* J. Johnſon, Eſq; had profited ſo little by his travels, and by his former experience, as not yet to underſtand the ſyſtem of the poſt-marks on letters, and the evidence reſulting from them. This letter of his

bears the Edinburgh mark of the 18th of January, (the day I received it), and the correſponding London mark of the 15th January 1793.——Between the 10th (the earlieſt day that the ſecond part of my letter could have reached Edinburgh) and the 15th, there is abundance of time for his letter to have gone from Edinburgh to London, and be put into the General Poſt-Office there on the 15th.

I found, to my great ſatisfaction, that he had not even ſuſpected my intention in writing him ſuch a letter as he had got from me; but had conſidered it only as a diſcharge of bile, and (as he ſaid) was much entertained with it. He tells me, my arrows have miſſed their aim, &c. which I took the liberty not to believe; partly, I own, in conſideration of the letter I had received about twelve hours before.——He is to write a whole pamphlet againſt my Eſſays, to ſhew his mathematical knowledge, which in my obſervations on the date and poſt-marks of his former letter I had held very cheap; he is to ruin my Claſs, by expoſing the weakneſs and imperfections of my Lectures; he is to annoy me with letters from the principal towns

towns in the kingdom; he is to ſtick faſt to me; he is to meet me at Philippi.——He muſt have been exceſſively entertained indeed with my letter.

On returning to my own houſe I received Dr J. H.'s ſecond letter, which he hath alſo printed. If it had not been for the unfortunate accident of my meeting the letter-carrier, and his knowing me, and giving me my letters on the ſtreet, I ſhould have received, at the ſame moment, the ſecond letter of Dr J. H. junior, and the ſecond letter of J. Johnſon, Eſq; —both of them threatening me with publication vengeance. —— The common time of the arrival of the London poſt, and conſequently of the delivery of the letters that come by it, is well known.

Thus I found myſelf placed between two fires; one from the open ſtationary battery of Dr J. H. junior, on the Caſtle Hill of Edinburgh, the other from the maſked flying battery of J. Johnſon, Eſq; in Pater-Noſter Row, at Benares, nay, perhaps, at every town in the kingdom. It was impoſſible to reſiſt ſuch ſuperior artillery, and ſuch exquiſite generalſhip. I there-

fore ſubmitted in ſilence. The firſt diſcharge from Dr J. H.'s battery ſoon took place; to the aſtoniſhment and entertainment of all who heard it: the deeper thunders of J. Johnſon's artillery are ſtill in reſerve.

Now all theſe coincidences may have been accidental; but I own they do not appear ſo to me. I beg it may be obſerved, however, that I do not preſume to aſſert or allege, that J. Johnſon, Eſq; was at laſt caught in his own trap; nor yet, that Dr J. H. junior is J. Johnſon, Eſq; nor that he ever had any connection or correſpondence with him, or ever ſaw, or ever heard of my letter to him. *Poſt hoc, ergo propter hoc*, I know is but ſcurvy Logic. At any rate, I am no more entitled to hazard a ſimple allegation than I am to make oath on thoſe points. The impropriety, though perhaps not the falſity, of ſuch an oath or allegation muſt be very apparent. It would be virtually aſſerting or ſwearing to the infalliibility of my own judgement, in the inference I drew from the various concurrent circumſtances which I have mentioned: for, in every act of

of belief founded either wholly or partly on circumſtantial evidence, there is involved ſome exerciſe of judgement. Now ſuch judgement may be erroneous; and it certainly is not quite uniform among different people, as belief is, when founded on the evidence of intuition, of demonſtration, of ſenſe, or of good direct teſtimony. Hence it is, that mere circumſtantial evidence, though it muſt always have great weight, foraſmuch as belief is involuntary, is not by itſelf deemed legal proof, on which a perſon may be convicted in any penal caſe. Hence too it is, that our Scottiſh jurymen, who decide by a majority, often differ irreconcileably, as to the force of evidence, partly circumſtantial, partly of teſtimony.

On the point in queſtion, all that I am entitled to allege or to ſwear, is, that I wrote ſuch a letter, with all the circumſtances of time, place, and manner which I have ſtated, and for the very purpoſe of producing an exploſion from the perſon who ſhould receive it; and Dr J. H.'s printed letters amply teſtify, that, in *a few days*, the exploſion took place in the very perſon in whom I expected and intended

to

to produce it.—The oſtenſible reaſon of the exploſion is a *miſrepreſented* account of what I had ſaid more than *five weeks* before; and which, ſuppoſing it to have been as it is ſtated, and alſo to have been really injurious to Dr J. H. junior, would have been (what my letter never could be) a very fit ſubject for legal proſecution; to which teſt I had repeatedly deſired that my conduct, and the myſterious origin of the Pamphlet, might be brought.——The ultimate inference from theſe, and all the other particulars that I have ſtated in the preceding pages, I leave to the candid, attentive, intelligent reader. For my own part, I do not ſcruple to avow that the perfect coincidence of ſo many particulars, independently of any direct teſtimony or information, would have produced in me the fulleſt conviction that Dr J. H. junior was concerned in the compoſition and publication of the Pamphlet which bears the name of J. Johnſon, Eſq. To the beſt of my judgement ſuch coincidences could not have been by mere chance; nor yet by any deſign or contrivance: and like the exact fitting of tallies, or the diſcovery of a key that fully explains a writing

in

in cypher, they ſeem to partake ſo much of the nature of demonſtration as to make the oppoſite belief impoſſible. If this be poſſible, it can be produced only by fairly and rationally accounting for them all ſome other way.

Having mentioned my receiving two letters from J. Johnſon, Eſq; and two from Dr J. H. junior, it is proper to ſay, in juſtice to the latter, that the letters from J. Johnſon are not in the ſame hand-writing with his. The ſpelling of J. Johnſon's letters, as will appear from the printed letter, is ſomewhat peculiar. But a more extraordinary remark has been made on his letters. Some perſons, at the firſt ſight of them, have gueſſed them to be in the hand-writing of a woman. This did not occur to myſelf on reading his firſt letter; nor am I even yet quite convinced that the remark is juſt. But it is ſomewhat confirmed by the unqueſtionable fact that the ſpelling at leaſt is female, forming a curious contraſt with the claſſical learning diſplayed in the quotation from *Perſius*, (*Pag.* 49.), which, by the by, was originally wrong ſpelt too; *ſuppellex*, inſtead

ſtead of *ſupellex* : but this peculiar ſpelling, which was a blunder in proſody, as well as etymology, J. Johnſon, Eſq; had corrected, by eraſing with a pen the ſecond *p*.

Theſe things I take notice of, not as matters of mere idle curioſity, but as leading irreſiſtibly to the dilemma, that J. Johnſon, Eſq; either employs occaſionally a female *Amanuenſis*, or elſe is itſelf an Hermaphrodite. I incline to the former opinion ; but I own it is a moot point.

IX.

IX.

IN a kind of poſtſcript ſubjoined to his ſecond letter to me, Dr J. H. mentions, that to *it* (the one in which he told me that my letter and my conduct ſhould be laid before the Public) no reply had been made, at the time he printed the letters.

No reply ever was made to it, nor could any be reaſonably expected. Certainly I ſhould never think of carrying on any correſpondence with a man whoſe avowed purpoſe was to lay my letter before the public, that the public might judge how far my conduct had been upright and open; and who was actually employing miſrepreſentation and falſehood in the account which he gave of my words and of my conduct. I did not even think it incumbent on me to ſet him right as to

thoſe miſrepreſentations, being convinced they were wilful. As he ſeemed to think, notwithſtanding what I had told him, that I muſt be afraid of an appeal to the public, I choſe rather to let him feel his miſtake than to tell him of it.

Next to that ſtrict judicial inveſtigation of the queſtion reſpecting the origin of the Pamphlet which I had been endeavouring to obtain, and which would have enabled me to call on the proper witneſſes, and perhaps get direct teſtimony in addition to the internal and circumſtantial evidence, nothing could be more agreeable to me, than to have a fair opportunity of ſtating publicly the internal and circumſtantial evidence by themſelves. In my own opinion they are amply ſufficient to decide the queſtion to the private conviction of every individual, and of courſe as to public opinion, which is but the aggregate of many private opinions. If they were not ſufficient, I ſhould have wiſhed them to be fairly examined and ſet aſide; for I had no ill-will, and meant no injuſtice, to either of the perſons ſuſpected. At any rate, I could not have prevented Dr J. H. from making his appeal to the Public;

lic; and ſince he was to do it, I own it was gratifying to me to ſee him ſet out with the moſt unequivocal evidence of his own diſingenuity.——In this reſpect he has been very obliging to me.

When a man who ſays he is injured, inſtead of ſeeking that effectual redreſs which the impartial laws of his country would certainly afford him, tries the inadequate, precarious, diſgraceful expedient of an appeal to the public, he muſt no doubt have ſome very particular reaſons for acting in a manner apparently ſo preposterous. It muſt certainly be thought, either that he is not ſo much injured as he would have the public believe, or at leaſt that there are circumſtances of his ſtory not quite fit for ſtrict judicial enquiry.

When a man who makes ſuch an appeal, and wiſhes the public to decide in his cauſe, inſtead of telling the whole tale, tells but a very little of it, and that little very erroneouſly, ſtating only what is in his own favour, ſuppreſſing whatever can make againſt him, and miſrepreſenting the words, the meaning, and the conduct of his adverſary, it muſt be believed

that he has the moſt ſubſtantial reaſons for acting in a manner ſo evidently diſingenuous.

Such however has been the conduct of Dr J. H. in his appeal to the public. He has ſtated the evidence (if evidence it may be called which can have no weight) in his own favour; I mean his diſavowal of the Pamphlet imputed to him. But he has ſaid not one word of the ſtrong internal and circumſtantial evidence on which the common belief with reſpect to the origin of the Pamphlet is founded. Unleſs theſe were alſo ſtated, the public could not judge what regard was due to his diſavowal. No man can be ſuppoſed ſo weak and ignorant as to think the diſavowal or denial of a ſuſpected perſon complete proof of his innocence, in oppoſition to all poſſible internal and circumſtantial evidence.

In his firſt letter to me he ſtated very preciſely, that he had been told by ſeveral people that I ſtill perſiſted in alleging that the work (the "Guide") originated from him, or that he had aſſiſted the author.

As there might have been a *bona fide* miſtake, either on his part, or that of his informers, with reſpect to what I had ſaid,

ſaid, notwithſtanding all my care, not only not to hazard any ſimple poſitive allegation on thoſe points, but to ſtate expreſsly what was the nature and ground of my conviction with reſpect to them, I thought it incumbent on me to explain the matter fully to him; which I did in the following words:—" Having no direct know-
" ledge of who were or who were not con-
" cerned in the compoſition and publica-
" tion of the Pamphlet you mention, I
" never thought myſelf entitled to *allege*,
" or ſimply and poſitively aſſert, that you
" or that your father had or had not any
" concern in it. On the contrary, I
" thought it would have been neceſſary
" for the Univerſity to have obtained a
" ſtrict judicial enquiry into that matter,
" which enquiry ſhould have terminated
" either in the full and honourable ac-
" quittal, or in the complete conviction
" and exemplary puniſhment of the per-
" ſon *ſuſpected*. —— You know perfectly
" the general ſuſpicions and opinion
" which have prevailed concerning the
" origin and purpoſe of that Pamphlet.
" You know alſo on what particulars of
" internal evidence and collateral circum-

" ſtances

" ſtances that opinion is founded. From
" the hour I read the Pamphlet I adopted
" that opinion, and I ſtill retain it. I
" have mentioned it openly, and alſo
" the reaſons on which it is founded;
" particularly in ſo far as related to your
" Father.

" This, I preſume, the perſons who
" gave you your information have call-
" ed, perſiſting in alleging that the Pam-
" phlet originated from you."

As he alſo mentioned, " the conſe-
" quences of *falſely calumniating* any per-
" ſon's character," I told him in my an-
ſwer, " If you think fit to do me the ho-
" nour to ſingle me out as the object ei-
" ther of your perſonal reſentment, or of
" legal proſecution, for that general and
" very natural opinion, you are heartily
" welcome."

I could not tell him in more explicit terms, that my firm conviction with reſpect to the origin of the Pamphlet depended not on my own direct knowledge of it, but on the force of evidence which I deemed competent and ſtrong, though

though it was not ſufficiently preciſe to touch either him alone, or his Father alone, excluſively of the other; and that I was willing to let it be made the ſubject of legal diſcuſſion.—But Dr J. H. did not chooſe to underſtand me.

In his ſecond letter to me, (the reply to mine), he ſays, "You mentioned to my "Father, on the 11th of December laſt, "that *you could bring your charge home to* "*me.* You have now DENIED that, and "ſhelter yourſelf under the canopy of "public *opinions* and *ſuſpicions.*" —— The firſt of theſe aſſertions is evidently his Father's, the two laſt of them plainly his own.

All three are *falſe.* The two laſt of them are ſuch glaring and palpable falſehoods, as hardly to require animadverſion. I know of no ſuch canopy as he mentions, nor of any ſhelter that public opinions and ſuſpicions could afford me: at any rate, I ſought no ſuch ſhelter; nay, I formally and explicitly renounced it, by telling him on what kind of evidence my opinion was founded, and inviting him to make my conduct the ſubject of legal proſecution.

Yet,

Yet, with a wonderful incongruity of thought, which would be abſolutely incredible, were it not aſcertained by his own printed letters, and which ſeems very near akin to ſome of the incongruities that appear in the Pamphlet of J. Johnſon, Eſq; he makes his appeal to that very public whoſe opinion he knew was ſo decidedly declared againſt him as to afford me ſhelter, or, in his own metaphorical language, to be a canopy to me.

As to the point of my being able to bring home my charge to him: in the firſt place, I never aſſerted it; and in the ſecond place, I never denied it.

That I never denied it, is evident from my letter which Dr J. H. hath printed, in which there is not one word about it; nor could I, when I was reading and anſwering his firſt letter, have gueſſed that he alluded to that point, or to any thing that had paſſed between his Father and me concerning it. To have ſaid on the 11th of December that I could bring my charge home to him, which, it ſhould ſeem, his Father had told him, and to perſiſt in alleging, on the 17th of January, that the Pamphlet originated with him, which he

ſaid

ſaid in his firſt letter he had been told by ſeveral people, are plainly very different things; eſpecially if it be conſidered that the diſcuſſion with reſpect to the Pamphlet took place in the intermediate time; viz. on the 22d of December, and on the 1ſt of January.——To change the terms employed in any ſtrict diſcuſſion, is always diſingenuous; it is never done, I believe, but in order to pervert their meaning; it can ſerve no other purpoſe; and it is equally ſhameful and unavailing.

I conceive that a perſon may reaſonably allege or ſimply aſſert any thing of which he has certain and direct knowledge, whether he can bring evidence of it or not; and that he may properly ſay that he can bring home a charge, if he can produce ſatisfactory evidence of it, whether he have any direct knowledge of it or not.

But the account of my converſation with Dr H. on the 11th of December is very imperfect; and, ſuppoſing it to have been reported by Dr H. as his Son has ſtated it, muſt be wilfully erroneous. It is an attempt to convey a lie in the words of

truth. All the words imputed to me were really uttered by me to Dr H. that day; but they are not all that I ſaid to him even in one ſentence, and by the ſuppreſſion of the reſt of the ſentence my meaning is perverted. My converſation with Dr H. was very ſhort, and I remember it diſtinctly.

On that day, to my great ſurpriſe, he accoſted me on the ſtreet, and after telling me that I had been very *raſh*, and that my conduct was *inſidious*, declared, as he had done the evening before, that he had no concern in the Pamphlet. I told him, *That* would appear on the enquiry. To this he anſwered with great warmth, "I defy all the Devils in Hell to bring it "home to *me*," with a peculiar emphaſis on the laſt word *me*; alluding, as I underſtood, to what he had ſaid the evening before, that he could not conceive how ſuch things about his lectures were in the Pamphlet, unleſs that his Son had been correſponding with ſomebody in London about it. This diſtinction between him and his Son I had always held very cheap; thinking it almoſt abſurd to ſuppoſe that the Father could be in any degree cleared by

by the conviction of his Son, his aſſiſtant in buſineſs and in teaching, and his known agent in the writing of books; more eſpecially when, to my certain knowledge, ſeveral of the ſentiments, and even expreſſions, and one very pointed intention, to be met with in the Pamphlet, were the Father's.——My reply to him (which put an end to our converſation) was, " No " matter, I ſhall bring it home *either* to " *you or* your Son.'—Any one who hath read the preceding pages may judge whether or not I was entitled to ſay ſo.—Take away but the three little words printed in Italics, and there will remain juſt what Dr J. H. with his Father's knowledge no doubt, and on his teſtimony, hath ſtated as what I ſaid to him.

It was very natural and very wiſe for Dr H. to wiſh to get out of the ſcrape himſelf, *ſi poſſet recte, ſi non quocunque modo*, even though he ſhould leave his Son in the lurch; and to chooſe to appear in the character of a witneſs, rather than in that of a party in the buſineſs: but I never underſtood that he could have his choice in that reſpect. The enquiry which I had propoſed the evening before that converſation,

ſation, and the particulars of internal and circumſtantial evidence which I ſtated to the Committee of the Univerſity eleven days after it, related ſolely to him. I ſtated that alternative to him at that time, in alluſion to what he had ſaid the evening before. For though in my own private opinion the internal and circumſtantial evidence brought it home both to him and his Son, yet I knew, that in the courſe of judicial proceedings, further evidence, I mean teſtimony, would be required: and I thought it *poſſible* that teſtimony might be obtained which would affect his Son only. I thought ſo for reaſons with which I meant to have regaled them both, whenever the queſtion came into a Court of Juſtice. Thoſe reaſons remain in full force, and await them ſtill.

I have no doubt that Dr H. heard all that I ſaid, as well as that part of it which he hath reported, and that he underſtood me perfectly.

The next time he chooſes to play the witneſs in his own cauſe, and in a caſe in which his intereſt and his paſſions are deeply

deeply concerned, he will pleaſe to remember, that it is the duty of a witneſs to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

From the tenor of his conduct and of his Son's letters, I judge that they conſider nothing but direct teſtimony as evidence of the origin of the Pamphlet, or *bringing home the charge.* This plainly was the notion of J. Johnſon, Eſq; as appears by his utterly neglecting the ſtrong internal and circumſtantial evidence in his work, while he took the utmoſt pains to prevent any teſtimony with reſpect to it from being obtained.

By the metaphorical phraſe *bringing home*, I underſtand, proving by competent evidence of any kind. By evidence I underſtand whatever produces belief. It may be of various kinds; internal, circumſtantial, or teſtimony, or all of them combined.

On ſome points internal evidence is ſupreme and concluſive: for example, with reſpect to the purpoſe of any written compoſition or publication. It would be abſurd to ſet about proving by teſtimony, that

that the Pamphlet of J. Johnſon, Eſq; was intended to raiſe the fame and promote the intereſt of Dr H. and to injure the profeſſional character and fortune of the Profeſſors of Botany and of Mathematics in this Univerſity. And it would be worſe than abſurd, to attempt to prove by teſtimony that it was not ſo. If an hundred witneſſes ſhould ſwear this, they could not be believed.

Deliberate inconſiſtency in any ſtory or declaration is deciſive evidence of falſehood; and if ſuch declaration were given on oath, the inconſiſtency would be legal evidence of perjury.

The perfect ſameneſs, or even very near reſemblance, both in thought and expreſſion, were it but in a ſingle ſentence or couplet, to the compoſition of a preceding author (if it were not acknowledged as borrowed) would be complete internal evidence of plagiariſm. Such ſameneſs or cloſe reſemblance in a whole work would, in certain circumſtances, be legal evidence of another kind of literary theft, which bookſellers call piracy.

Internal evidence, ſtrictly ſo called, I believe, can never be explained away, or otherwiſe

otherwiſe accounted for, as circumſtantial evidence often may be: Yet even this kind of evidence has great weight, unleſs it can be fairly accounted for, or explained away.

If a man were found robbed and murdered, and his property were found in the poſſeſſion of the perſon ſuſpected of the crime, and uſed by him as his own, tho' ſuch a circumſtance might not convict him, yet, if it were not well accounted for, it would fix indelible ſuſpicion on him.

Crim. Con. is generally proved chiefly or ſolely by circumſtantial evidence; for this good reaſon, that it is not uſually committed in preſence of witneſſes. If *Jack* were found in bed with *Tom*'s wife, it would be no direct proof that he had committed, or ever intended to commit adultery with her: it would be only a ſtrong circumſtance againſt him, which might be accounted for by proving that ſome of his companions had found him dead drunk, and had conveyed him thither by way of a frolic; the lady being faſt aſleep, or in the ſame ſituation with him,

him. But in the mean time (that is, till ſuch proof were given) *Tom*, though he might be egregiouſly miſtaken, would not be in the leaſt criminal, if he ſhould think himſelf a cuckold, and ſhould ſpeak and act as men uſually do in ſuch circumſtances. And if *Jack* ſhould offer no ſuch proof, and only ſay, that he ſuppoſed it might be ſo, or that he did not know how he came to be in that bed, *Tom* would be well entitled to ſhake his head, and hold faſt his firſt opinion, and pay as little regard to *Jack*'s proteſtations of his innocence, as has generally been paid to Dr J. H.'s diſavowal of the Pamphlet which bears the name of J. Johnſon, Eſq;

This point, with reſpect to the import of the term *evidence*, and the phraſe *bringing home*, is of great conſequence in this diſcuſſion. It is conceivable, that, *per fas aut nefas*, all direct teſtimony may be with-held or ſuppreſſed. In that caſe, according to Dr J. H.'s notion of the matter, there would be no evidence at all againſt him; that is, no more reaſon to think that he, than that any indifferent perſon, was concerned in the compoſition of the Pamphlet; and

of

of courſe, that the belief that he was concerned in it muſt be groundleſs, unjuſt, and malicious.

According to my notion of the matter, though every perſon who could give his teſtimony with reſpect to the origin of the Pamphlet, were annihilated, the various particulars of internal and circumſtantial evidence relating to it would fully juſtify and for ever eſtabliſh that opinion of its origin, which even a ſmall part of them had at firſt produced.

The only difference between the having or not having direct teſtimony in this caſe is, that with it there might be, while without it there could not be, legal conviction of the author. No court will depart, or ought to depart, in any particular caſe, however ſtrong the circumſtances of it may be, from its eſtabliſhed general rules of proceeding, whether theſe be of poſitive inſtitution, or only the reſult of reflection and cuſtom. Where the law requires two witneſſes to prove an act, a court will not be contented with one, though that one were *Cato* himſelf. Where the law requires two men to witneſs and authenticate the ſubſcription of a perſon to any deed or in-

ſtrument, a court will not be ſatisfied with the atteſtation of two women. But in all ſuch caſes the difference is only as to legal deciſion, not as to general and juſt belief, which does not depend on courts of juſtice, nor on any human laws.

From the conduct of Dr J. H. in attempting to vindicate himſelf by ſimply diſavowing the Pamphlet, it appears that he thought his own declaration ſufficient evidence, in oppoſition to the internal and circumſtantial evidence. I believe it was generally thought, and ſuch I am ſure was my opinion, that his diſavowal could have no more weight againſt that evidence, than it would have had in oppoſition to direct teſtimony, if this had been obtained by the judicial examination of competent witneſſes.

As he did not ſeem to underſtand the gentle hint which Dr Rutherford gave him on that point, I endeavoured, in my anſwer to his firſt letter to me, to explain it to him more fully; telling him,

" I never dreamed of aſking any per-
" ſon whether he were the author of that
" Pamphlet,

" Pamphlet, nor of paying any regard to
" any perſon's denial of his being concern-
" ed in it; for this plain reaſon, that I was
" ſure whoever was concerned in it would
" deny it. It contains ſuch things as no
" man can avow without incurring laſting
" infamy. This the author well knew;
" and accordingly publiſhed it under a
" falſe name, and with the moſt extraor-
" dinary precautions to baffle enquiry.
" He publiſhed it with a reſolution to de-
" ny it. The falſe name on the title-page
" is *ipſo facto* a denial of it by the real au-
" thor or authors."

I wiſhed to make Dr J. H. underſtand that his diſavowal of the Pamphlet, in the circumſtances in which he was placed, was juſt like a priſoner at the bar pleading *not guilty*, which has no force in oppoſition to any kind of evidence. Far from being conſidered as true, it is not even deemed a falſehood, when it is diſregarded in conſequence of the moſt deciſive evidence.

As I do not find that he hath paid any more regard to my explanation than he did to Dr R.'s hint, I ſhall tell him what

one of the wife men of Greece ſaid in a caſe ſomewhat ſimilar. A young man had unluckily incurred the ſuſpicion of Crim. Con. with his neighbour's wife; I preſume on circumſtantial evidence only. Diſpleaſed at the ſuſpicion, he aſked *Thales* whether he might not vindicate himſelf by his oath. "Young man" (anſwered the Sage) "Perjury is worſe than Adultery."

The two caſes, I own, are not exactly parallel; for in this one there is neither adultery nor perjury; nor can it be ſaid with truth, that the diſavowal is worſe than the deed; if there be any difference, it is leſs bad. But there is a wonderful incongruity of thought in it. It is ſelf-evident that no regard is due to any declaration of the author of the Pamphlet: he can have no pretenſions to veracity or credibility. What regard then can be paid to the declaration of one ſuppoſed to be the author of it?

Surely no man's ſimple declaration can be thought of more weight than his oath. Yet if a man, who, in any caſe in which his own paſſions and intereſt were deeply concerned, had incurred ſtrong and general

ral ſuſpicion of perjury, were to offer to prove his innocence by ſwearing that he was not perjured, we ſhould be more inclined to laugh at the expedient than to liſten to his oath. Such a mode of vindication is in truth a downright *Bull.* The only thing *ſimile aut ſecundum* to it that ever I heard of, was the conduct of the great *Baron Monkhauſen*, of authentic memory, when he had one night unluckily fallen into a deep pit, which he could not get out of. He waited there per force till morning; then went to a village two leagues off, whence he fetched a ſpade, and returned to the pit, and dug himſelf out.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

IT muſt no doubt appear ſtrange that this Anſwer to Dr J. H.'s printed letters ſhould be ſo long of appearing. They came forth the 21ſt of January. — The unavoidable length of this anſwer, as comprehending ſo many particulars and diſcuſſions, and my own well-known occupation in the Univerſity during the winter months, will in part account for the delay. But I muſt own there was another, and a ſtronger reaſon for it. J. Johnſon, Eſq; in his reply to my letter (which he ſays entertained him much) promiſed and vowed to write a whole Pamphlet of ſtrictures on a Philoſophical and Mathematical Eſſay which I publiſhed laſt year; and alſo an Analyſis of my Lectures, expoſing all their inſufficiencies

and

and blunders, &c. &c.; the latter is to prove his medical, the former to prove his mathematical knowledge. I have no doubt but his publications will be decisive in both these respects. The analysis of my Lectures I could not in reason and conscience expect to see till near the beginning of next winter. But the pamphlet against my Essay, I thought might have appeared by this time: for I am sure J. Johnson, Esq; is singularly qualified for such an undertaking, and could do it as well in one day as he could in seven years. I wished to have enriched this Answer with a few samples of his mathematics, of which his great discovery (page 36. 39.) had given me a very exalted notion. But as his pamphlet has not yet (after four months) appeared, and as I have no doubt that he had as early intelligence of the printing of this Answer as Dr J. H. had, I presume it is in vain to expect to see his Pamphlet till after this Answer has appeared. I must be satisfied therefore with the honour of announcing his pamphlet, which will certainly be expected with impatience and perused with avidity. For my own part, I have no doubt that it will infinitely surpass

pafs all the boafted performances of that great genius whofe unparalleled attainments in literature and fcience but a few years ago aftonifhed and delighted the great and gay world in London ; I mean *The Learned Pig.*

30*th May* 1793.